

Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 38

JUNE, 1932

Number 6

EDITORIAL

The Gospel According to St. Luke

THE French skeptic Renan called this the most beautiful book in the world, and it is indeed an engaging portrait that is presented to us in the third gospel.

There are many things about St. Luke's record of Jesus that give to it peculiar value. In the first place, the point of view from which he wrote is precisely the dominant point of view of this age. St. Luke was interested in reality, and so are men today. He wrote his gospel not to inspire his friend, but in order that his friend might know the certainty, the undoubted truth, of those things wherein already he had been instructed.

St. Luke had a careful, historical intellect, and he lived in immediate touch with the best first generation sources of information concerning the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. He knew James and probably also John and Peter, and the Virgin Mary. He was a travelling companion of St. Paul. He was in contact with the Church at Jerusalem, and probably also with the Church in Galilee.

Living in Caesarea for two years during St. Paul's imprisonment there he was within fifty-five miles of Jerusalem, and forty of Capernaum. What an opportunity for a man with a gift for historical investigation to develop the certainty of his data, especially when it is remembered that St. Luke wrote within thirty years of the events involved. His sources of information were those who had been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. He had an intimate knowledge of the important facts from the very beginning down to the time at which he was writing. His historical reliability has not been effectively challenged, and the more his statements are studied, the more their dependability is appreciated.

Then again, we know almost to a certainty the period from which St. Luke's Gospel came. There is a fine array of scholarship continuous for the last sixty years staunchly affirming the origin of St. Luke's Gospel during the lifetime of St. Paul. The great English scholars, Henry Alford and F. W. Farrar, who finished their work toward the close of the third quarter of the nineteenth century both hold this view. Frederick Godet, the great Swiss scholar, professor of New Testament at Neufchatelle, held it also. J. P. Langey, Philip Schaff, and Adolph Harnack himself, all three subscribe to this view, as do also Sir William Ramsay, one of the foremost living scholars, and Professor A. T. Robertson, who has no superior among Greek New Testament scholars in America.

But the evidence of the early origin for St. Luke's Gospel is little short of compelling. The abrupt ending of The Acts makes it clear that the author finished that second manuscript before the death of St. Paul. The probability is that The Acts ends so abruptly because it ends when St. Luke was leaving Rome toward the close of the apostle's first period of Roman imprisonment. This would be about the year 62, and would fix that as the most probable date of his second manuscript. The Gospel was written before The Acts. This is definite from the opening statements of the second work. The origin of the Gospel must therefore be pressed back into the sixth decade and the great Harnack believes that Caesarea and the year 58 is the probable time and place of its production.

The year 58; the city of Caesarea, accessible both to Jerusalem and Galilee; and an author with a carefully trained mind, who lived well within the bounds of the first

Christian generation,—what better authority could one have for the reliability of a great narrative.

In St. Mark's Gospel we have the testimony of an eye-witness. It is St. Peter's recollections and narrative of Jesus. St. Mark was the amanuensis. In St. John's Gospel we have the testimony of another eye-witness—the long meditated upon recollections of the burning soul of the beloved St. John. But in St. Luke's Gospel we do not have just the testimony of a single individual; rather we have the historical conclusions of a trained intellect, whose passion was to develop certainty.

Criticism generally assumes that St. Luke had two chief sources: St. Mark's Gospel, and a collection of the teachings of Jesus familiarly known as Harnack's "Q". One would judge from his introduction that St. Luke had many sources, and that not a few of them were contacts with living witnesses, who were able to detail to him their own recollections of Jesus. It is interesting to note that St. Luke has reserved for us eighteen original parables of Jesus, and seven original miracles. He also has preserved many exquisitely beautiful details not recorded in the other gospels. For example, the birth of the forerunner; the intimate experiences of the Virgin Mary; the song of the angels; the wonder of the shepherds; the incidents connected with the circumcision of Jesus; and then, at the other end of the record, the intercession of the cross; the great promise to the penitent robber; the prayer of faith that immediately preceded His death; the wonderful appearance of Jesus to the two who were walking to Emmaus on the first Easter evening. It is almost as if one had shared these experiences to read St. Luke's vivid, burning narratives.

The historical accuracy of St. Luke has been verified on so many points that one is inclined to agree with Sir William Ramsay in his conclusion, that an author who has been demonstrated repeatedly to have been careful in many minute details, can be accepted as accurate in others where the confirming evidence may be as yet not fully developed.

TAKE an instance or two of the proven accuracy of St. Luke. There was a wide variety in the governments of the cities visited by St. Paul on his missionary journeys,

and there was also a considerable frequency of change in these governments. Cities passed from the authority of the Emperor to the authority of the Senate and back again. So again at one period they would be Greek free cities, and at another, Roman colonies. These differences of administration would be reflected in the official titles of their magistrates, and also in the order of judicial and political procedure. With so much of difference and change, it would be exceedingly difficult to develop accuracy, and only a careful intellect in actual touch with events in the several communities and at the times in question, could possibly have attained the extraordinary accuracy which characterizes St. Luke's narrative.

For example, Antioch of Pisidia was a Roman colony at the time St. Paul visited it on his first missionary journey. As a colony, if the apostle's message stirred up opposition, it would have been necessary for those who were exercised to have brought influence to bear upon the official group, through whom alone the missionary's expulsion could have been accomplished. In Acts 13:50 we find that precisely this is what St. Luke says took place.

Iconium, on the contrary, when St. Paul visited it on his first missionary journey, was a Greek free city and the government, therefore, was in the hands of the populace. To have accomplished the removal of St. Paul from such a city under the circumstances, it would have been necessary to have called a town meeting and to have argued the case. There would have been excitement, tumult, with some crying for one thing, and some for another. This again is precisely what St. Luke records as having occurred (Acts 14:4,5).

Leaving Iconium, St. Luke tells us that the Apostle Paul fled to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia. Here again Luke is right. From the natural appearance of the country, and also from certain early records, it seemed that Lystra belonged to the Greek free city of Iconium; but more recently a boundary stone has been discovered which definitely establishes the fact that these cities did indeed belong to the government of Lycaonia. Again St. Luke is seen to have been right.

Perhaps one of the most remarkable instances of St. Luke's accuracy is preserved for us in connection with the city of Thessalonica. There we are told St. Paul was well

received by the most influential personalities in the city. St. Luke tells us that the rulers in this city were called politarchs. Here, until quite recently, it was thought there was an evident inaccuracy by St. Luke. The name politarch was unknown in contemporary Greek literature.

However, some few years ago, a carved stone was found in this city, being a portion of a memorial arch which had stood at the western end of the main street, and had been known as the Vardar Gate. This stone contained the name of the rulers of the city. They were called politarchs, and it is a striking coincidence that three of the six names are Sopater, Gaius and Secundus.

Two of St. Paul's companions from the city of Thessalonica as listed in Acts 20:4, are Aristarchus and Secundus, and at the time of the uproar when Demetrius and the other silversmith of Ephesus made a tumult against St. Paul, Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, were captured by the populace (Acts 19:29).

In Romans 16:21 Sopater is with Paul at Corinth. In the case of Gaius and Sopater, the identification is only probable. In the case of Secundus, however, it is definite, but in any event, here are the names of three of the Politarchs of Thessalonica preserved upon the monument which stood at the western end of the main street, known as the Vardar Gate.

To mention one more instance of St. Luke's accuracy, the city of Corinth became proconsular in the year of 44, so that St. Luke's record that Gallio held such an office in 51-53 is correct. It is probably too early yet to speak with final definiteness about the two terms of Quirinius as governor of Syria, but the fact that he did conduct a campaign against the Homonadenses in Cilicia, and that he was made honorary governor of one of the cities of that section, doubtless as a recognition of his successful military campaign, and that this campaign must have taken place during the first decade B.C., would seem once again to indicate the accuracy of St. Luke. It is interesting to note that both Mommsen and Ramsay defend St. Luke's accuracy in this item. The latter holding that Quirinius was governor of Syria somewhere between 10 and 6 B.C.

So far as the fact of a Roman census and the peculiar method of carrying it out recorded in St. Luke's Gospel, both of these

items are now well established historical facts. Archaeology has collected numerous census papers at fourteen year intervals from the year 20 on, and some of these papers in certain sections of the Empire call for precisely the method of taking the census described by St. Luke in his Gospel.

The narrative in St. Luke 5, where the evangelist gives a slightly different version of the actual calling of Andrew and Peter, James and John, throws a particularly attractive light upon our Lord's personality. As St. Luke describes the circumstance, Jesus came to Capernaum after he had circulated somewhat in Galilee, preached from the stern of St. Peter's boat, and then commanded him to go out into the deep and let down his net for a draft. St. Peter obeyed, and immediately enclosed a multitude of fish. This marvelous event moved him profoundly. He fell down at Jesus' feet and cried, "Lord, depart from me for I am a sinful man." Jesus responded, "Fear not, Simon, from henceforth thou shalt catch men."

In the 21st Chapter of John's Gospel, when St. Peter had again failed his Lord and he and a group of his friends were once more fishing on Galilee, Jesus repeats the incident. He appears to them standing on the shore. This time, as before, their night of fishing had been fruitless. Jesus commands them to cast their nets in on the other side of the ship. Obeying Him immediately they enclose a multitude of fish. The penitent disciple's mind instantly goes back across the years to his earlier re-calling. In the new wonder he hears Jesus say again, "Fear not, Simon, from henceforth thou shalt catch men." This tender reminder of that earlier experience preserved by St. John, and standing against the background of St. Luke's narrative, reveals our Lord in a most attractive light. It shows Him as sensitive to tender memories, and brings His personality preciously near us.

There is a good bit of such material in St. Luke's Gospel, material not found in the other evangelists. It puts us deeply in St. Luke's debt. We are grateful to him for his splendid historical studies. How sorry we would be to lose the parable of the Prodigal Son; of that of the Pharisee and the Publican; or of the Rich Fool, and of Dives and Lazarus, and the Good Samaritan; but they would all have been lost if it had not been for St. Luke.

WE might, in closing, list some other peculiarly beautiful materials preserved by St. Luke alone. In the account of the shepherds of the Nativity, who came to see the prophetic promise fulfilled, St. Luke records them as having said, "Let us go even unto Bethlehem and see this word which has become (a fact), which the Lord hath made known unto us" (2:15).

This evangelist alone has preserved for us any glimpse at the childhood of Jesus. There is a world of meaning in His words to His mother, "How is it that ye sought me, wist ye not that it was necessary for me to be among the things of my Father?"

The story of the sinful woman who anointed Jesus' feet in the house of Simon of Capernaum is another Lukan gem. The story seems to have an unrelated background, some manifestation of forgiving grace that had won this woman's heart. One wonders whether the sinful woman of Jerusalem of whom we hear in John 8:1-11 may not be the same. This section of the Johannine account is variously placed. One manuscript puts it after verse 36 of the 7th chapter; ten other manuscripts put it at the end of St. John's Gospel; four put it in St. Luke after chapter 21. This textual problem is interesting, but the two accounts fit each other perfectly. If this woman of Capernaum be indeed the sinful woman of Jerusalem forgiven and restored to virtue by her contact with Jesus, we can understand both her act of the anointing and also Jesus' words, which thus point to her love as the evidence of her experience of forgiveness (7:36-50).

There is a unique light thrown upon Jesus' life by St. Luke in the opening verses of his eighth chapter. Here are introduced a group of women of property who followed Him and ministered to his physical needs. The list includes Mary Magdalene, Joanna wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna. We are rejoiced indeed to find our Lord's life thus not totally without earth's physical comforts. We are rejoiced also by this circumstance to see Him lifted completely clear from any suggestion of class consciousness. All men whether rich or poor were alike for Him immortal souls called to a divine and infinite destiny.

Luke's ninth chapter shows his grasp upon the philosophy of Jesus' history. He presses close together the mission of the twelve apostles in Galilee, the feeding of the five thousand, which is the climax of our Lord's work

in Galilee, the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi and the Transfiguration. And these four events are logically thus close together. The ministry of the twelve assembled the great throng at the Passover season of 29. The majesty of Jesus' person was brought to supreme expression in that creative work on the east side of Galilee when he fed these people with the contents of a boy's lunch basket.

After this self-manifestation the next event in order is the confession of the apostles, "Thou art the Christ of God," and then the Transfiguration, with Moses and Elias talking with Jesus about "His decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." And this is indeed the philosophy of Jesus' life. He could not announce His Deity, men had to catch it. After they have seen it, then He must help them to see His cross. St. Luke stands all this out vividly by omitting a body of interesting events preserved by the other synoptists. He has compressed his narrative to make the philosophy of its events more evident.

In the story of Gethsemane he has preserved the vivid tragic fact of the bloody sweat. It was not great drops of blood, but thick clots of blood (22:44). The apostles doubtless found these marks of Jesus' extreme agony the next morning after his arrest. St. Luke is also alone in preserving an account of one of Jesus' most beautiful miracles, the healing of Malchus' ear, which St. Peter had cut off during the excitement of the arrest (22:51).

IT is indeed a "most beautiful book," this Gospel according to Luke. St. John is richer in expressions of our Lord's self-consciousness but St. Luke is fully abreast of him in his grasp of the Incarnation. Fore-announced all down the centuries, introduced by angelic visitants, conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, identified by seers, accredited by the opening heaven and the descending Dove, mighty both in word and deed, speaking for the ages and commanding even the grave to release its prey, giving His life a sacrifice for sin in fulfillment of the prophetic word, triumphing over death, ascending again to heaven,—this is the portrait of Jesus which St. Luke has presented. And let us remember he wrote within thirty years of the events he has narrated. He wrote not as an eye-witness but as an historian and investigator of the experi-

ences of others. He wrote that he might make clear the "undeniable truth" of these wonderful events in which all Christians were then instructed.

How interesting it would be if some great scholar and intellect like John Alfred Faulkner, or Adolph Harnack of Deismann could have lived in that time and prepared for us a critical study of the life of Jesus! Well, and is not this precisely what we have in the

Gospel according to Luke? Luke, the physician, a man of letters, a trained intellect who had spent much time in investigating the truth of Jesus and had become thoroughly convinced of its "unquestionable truth" has written down for us well within the bounds of the first Christian generation his careful conclusions concerning the most wonderful life that ever was lived in this the most beautiful book in the world.—H. P. S.

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

The Views of Plato and Aristotle

ATTENTION cannot be called too often to Professor W. Schmidt's strikingly important book, *The Origin and Growth of Religion*, of which Dr. W. Bell Dawson gave an extended review in last month's issue of this magazine. It is a book of unique ability and technical scholarship. It is also of signal value and relevance just at this time when so many harmful theories are afloat in the world of thought. The work is of both scientific and religious importance. On page 19 the author tells us what were the views of Plato and Aristotle on the subject of religion and its origin. We quote with pleasure:

Plato and Aristotle, and before them Anaxagoras, postulate a governing intelligence as the beginning of all things, and both teach degeneration, assuming that religion was formerly higher and purer.

The Caliber of Barnes

A correspondent has suggested to us to give our estimate of the caliber of Harry Elmer Barnes, the author of a bitter book against Christianity. His measurement can be taken in one little moment from one sentence in his book where he attributes the following to the typical Christian believer:

The typical believer takes it for granted that God dictated the Bible in the language of the King James Version, (or, if a German, in the language of Luther's translation).

There! that shows the caliber of Harry Elmer Barnes! It shows just how much knowledge he has of "the typical believer" whom he holds up to ridicule. A man who is capable of making such a "break" as Barnes did should go back in his educational career and enter the Freshman class of one of our colleges. Among the thousands of Christian people of all degrees of intelligence whom

we have met, we have never known one who thought that God had dictated the Bible in the version of King James. In a magazine article, which appeared later, Dr. Barnes cites one case, but a single case could not logically be called "typical."

Inadequacy of Herbert Spencer's View

Our erudite author, Dr. Schmidt, uses his critical faculty on Herbert Spencer's theory that religion had its origin in ghost-worship. Spencer, says Schmidt, worked out the theory of development "too ruthlessly." That must mean that he bent the facts to fit his theory. Then Dr. Schmidt passes these criticisms on Spencer and his method:

Moreover, the documentation was hopelessly inexact. Neither title, date or page of the works quoted is ever given, because, to cite the reason adduced by Spencer himself, to look at such notes "is a waste of energy and time!" Andrew Lang also accuses him of getting his documentation done "by proxy," through the agency of helpers whose instructions were to look for facts in support of his theory. The result, of course, was that data of a contrary kind were simply omitted.

A Waning Theory

The following facts are gleaned from the *Sunday School Times*. The title of a revised work by M. Lelande, the well-known French scientist, is *Evolutionary Illusions*. In reviewing this book the leading Parisian daily, *Temps*, has this to say:

When it (this book) first appeared in 1899 it met considerable opposition. The theory of evolution was then in its glory, had the support of all the *savants*, inspired the method of history and literary criticism. Now the time has come to listen to a criticism of these ideas once so popular, now verging on their decline. The theory of evolution has come on scientific difficulties which it has not succeeded in surmounting.

Even a Rabbi May Err

In a recent article by Ernest Gordon we are informed that Rabbi Clifton H. Levy is not as well acquainted with the Old Testament as he should be, considering his position. He says that, "from the Jewish point of view, Solomon was son of God just as much as was Jesus, and that he served his people quite as wisely." Then Mr. Gordon comes back at the Rabbi by quoting the exact language of the Bible regarding the character of Solomon in the latter part of his career, after he had departed from the counsel of the Lord. Here it is, recorded in 1 Kings 11:6-9:

And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord, and went not fully after the Lord as did David his father. Then Solomon built an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill which is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Moab. And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods. And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, who had appeared unto him twice.

This rabbi should have read his Bible more carefully.

Spencer Revolted at Annihilation

One of our recent authors tells us that Herbert Spencer, the well-known agnostic of the last century, made a frank confession concerning the idea of being forever annihilated. "The thought that presently I shall cease to be," said Spencer, "is a thought from which my whole being revolts." We believe that to be the general feeling of mankind. Well, there is no need for any one to cherish such a gloomy and defeatist idea. Christ, who came out from infinity and eternity, and therefore knew then, and knows now, what are the conditions there, speaks in no uncertain terms about a future life, saying: "In my Father's abode are many homes; I go to prepare a place for you." The apostle Paul also gives us this uplifting assurance: "Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light."

What Says the Bible of the Blood?

People who express repugnance at the doctrine of the blood of Christ place and align themselves; they tell us just what they are and where they stand. They are anti-Biblical. Whatever may be said for them, and whatever they may say of themselves, they are plainly against the teaching of the Bible. When they read Jesus' words, "This

cup is the New Testament in my blood, shed for many for the remission of sons," these fastidious Modernists must feel themselves repelled. Writes an inspired apostle: "But if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." And who were the redeemed persons whom John saw in his apocalyptic vision rejoicing before the throne of God in the heavenly Jerusalem? The angel tells us who they were: "These are they that have come up out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." So people who are "revolted" at the idea of redemption through the blood of Christ are "revolted" at the teaching of Christ and the Bible.

A Conglomerate Religion

Our friend, Dr. J. A. W. Haas, President of Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., describes what he calls "A New Religion" in a recent issue of *The Lutheran* (March 24, 1932). He says that, in many of our state universities and other secular schools, courses in religion are being introduced. But all religions are treated alike. No distinction is made between the true and the false. All religions are on a par. The Christian religion is not taught as if it were true. The church is ignored, or when anything is said about it, it is usually criticized. Dr. Haas makes a strong plea for the church to do her duty faithfully in sending her young people to Christian colleges, where they will learn that Christianity is the true religion. In the face of this serious situation, he asks some penetrating questions:

What is the duty of the church in the light of this rationalism posing as religion? How is the church building up its institutions? How is it directing its youth? Does it make no difference where your young people go to college? Is the inroad on faith of no importance? . . . Are we meeting this modern challenge through the deepening of the faith of our people?

A Sample Chapel Service

In his valuable article, just referred to, Dr. Haas cites what he calls "an extreme example of this new religion, which, after all, is not really new." It is a description of a chapel service in one of the technical schools of our country, and was described as follows to Dr. Haas by a professor of religion and philosophy:

We use our chapel, not only to read from the Bible, but also from the writings of Buddha and other religionists. Often we have no prayer, because we do not want to force the religious mood. If a student is an atheist or agnostic, we give him literature of this type and let him work out his position. To a Catholic we show the works of Thomas Aquinas. A Protestant is introduced to the works of Schwenkfeld. No religion is to be judged as either true or false. All are to be studied impartially.

In view of such teaching in our secular school is not the distinctively Christian college a necessity?

The Christian World View

It is true enough that man could not discover the principal tenets of the Christian religion by mere human research and reason. They had to be divinely revealed, and we have the record of their revelation in the Bible. But after they have been revealed, they can be shown to be reasonable and adequate. For example, it is reasonable to believe that a personal, all-wise and all-powerful God created this universe. Then it has competent intelligent guidance, and will not plunge into universal ruin, as it surely would if it were merely a vast insensate and unconscious machine. Then, too, we can explain the design so evident in the realm of nature. More than that, we can account for the creation and existence of such personal beings as the individuals of the human race. It is surely reasonable to believe that personality must have come from personality. It is unreasonable to believe that it came from any other source. Self-conscious and sentient persons surely could not have evolved from impersonal substance. Something cannot come from nothing. So what is known as the theistic world-view is reasonable. That is the world-view revealed in the Bible.

The Biblical Doctrine of Man

Since it is reasonable to believe that there is a God and that He created and upholds the universe, it is reasonable to believe that He created man in His own image. For him to have created a universe of mere machines and vegetables and animals, and stop there, would hardly have been a reasonable procedure. Being Himself a personal being, it is very probable that He would have created personal beings like Himself with whom He could have communion. One would think He would delight in such beings. Then if He created self-conscious personalities in His own similitude, it is rational to believe that

He would take an interest in them, would instruct them what to do, would place them in a pleasant habitat, and confer upon them many favors; also that He would often come to them and hold fellowship with them. All this is so reasonable that one would think everybody would believe it, or at least would feel that it ought to be true. Well, this rational view of man and his relation to God and the world is revealed in the Bible. Ought people to feel hostile to such a doctrine? On the contrary, ought they not to rejoice in knowing that God has made such a revelation to mankind?

Redemption and Destiny

We have no desire to evade the mystery of sin and sorrow in the world. No doubt God could have prevented them; but He could have done so only by making men mere automata—happy beings, but non-moral in character. It is more reasonable to believe that He made them moral beings, capable of choosing between good and evil. More than that, we find that, whoever or whatever brought human beings into existence, He (or It) did make them moral agents, because people today have the power to choose between right and wrong. And still more, we know that men are prone to do evil and that there is plenty of unhappiness in the world. So, however they came about, sin and sorrow are here, and we cannot blink or wink them out of existence. Now, since they are in the world, it is reasonable to believe that the God who made man would come to his rescue. If it was necessary for God, in order to uphold the moral constitution of the universe, to sacrifice himself out of love for mankind to redeem them, it is most reasonable to believe that He would do so, just as it is reasonable for parents to make sacrifice for their children. Furthermore, it is reasonable to believe that God would not permit personal beings, created in His own image, to live in a world a little span of years and then perish forever. It is much more reasonable to believe that He would prepare a worth-while destiny for them. Well, all these rational doctrines are taught with marvellous clarity in the Bible.

But what is the Status of Materialism?

Perhaps the most outstanding world-view that is opposed to Christianity is materialism. It holds that the only substance existent is

material substance. All things can be explained through the potency of matter. Is this philosophy—it is not science—reasonable? Let us see. It must assume that matter is eternal. If it is not eternal, it must have been created, and so there must be something else that is existent besides matter, namely, the Creator of matter. Surely matter could not have created itself out of nothing. But is it reasonable to believe that matter is eternal? If it were eternal, it would have to be infinite; but that is impossible, because it is made up of finite parts, and therefore as a whole it must be finite, however vast its magnitude. If it were eternal, it would have to be self-existent and independent; but that cannot be so, because all its parts are dependent, and therefore as a whole it must be dependent. Moreover, if it were eternal and at the same time an evolving universe, it would have reached its present status long ago because it had eternity in which to develop. That which is eternal must, by the very nature of the case, be infinite, absolute, independent and self-existent; and these are attributes that can be assigned only to an infinite spiritual or psychical being. Besides, insensate matter never could have brought forth self-conscious personal beings: for that would have been tantamount to "getting something out of nothing." So materialism as a philosophy is neither reasonable nor adequate.

What shall we Say of Pantheism?

This philosophy has some vogue today among the Modernists who over-emphasize the immanence of God and either deny or ignore His transcendence. It is an old philosophy. It is the taproot of Hinduism, which was founded centuries before Christ. Perhaps the most thoroughgoing pantheism in the world today is the Hindu system of religion. Be that as it may, is pantheism a reasonable system of philosophy? We think it is not. Several fatal objections may be brought against it. First, the universe presents many evidences of design, purpose and adaptation that connote intelligence; and intelligence connotes self-conscious personality as the Producer or Creator; but the pantheist denies the personality of God. Second, the impersonal All of pantheism never could have brought forth personal beings such as we men are, for every effect must have an adequate cause. To put it patly, the impersonal never could have evolved into the personal.

Third, pantheism teaches that the human soul will finally be re-absorbed in the impersonal All and lose consciousness forever. Such a view is not reasonable. Now, contrast these inadequate philosophies with the rational, adequate and attractive character of the Christian world-view.

Important Mailing Instructions—Read

ALL Publishers will tell you that the most worried man in the office is the custodian of the mail list. Few people can appreciate what it means to keep a list perfect.

The entering of a new name or the making of a change of address means that two persons besides the custodian must handle the request without a slip. But how easy it is for one man to slip when thousands of names are handled! Also give Full and Complete mailing directions, *Plainly Written*.

Note this: One of our subscribers, preparing to visit a relative, requested address change as follows: John Doe, care Jim Doe, Washington. He lived near Washington, D. C., and we made change. Two months later he returned home and found two issues missing. He visited at Washington but not Washington, D. C.!

How much safer it would have been had he asked the Postmaster or some friend to forward his magazine these two months! And, do you know what this mistake cost us? To make any change costs us no less than 10 cents, or 20 cents to make these two changes. The magazines missent cost 35 cents. Total 55 cents! Not much—no, but 100 such mistakes cost \$55—quite an item!

A Problem in Mathematics for Some Bright Student

Suppose CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE is published at a loss of, say, \$2,000—not including the mail list cost—what percentage is its loss if 2,850 subscribers request a change costing 10 cents each, on a mail list representing 4,950 subscribers?

Will You Co-operate?

You can help a lot if when you contemplate visiting this summer or next winter you will request your *Postmaster* or *some friend* to *forward* magazine to you during time you are away. This will save much concern and expense.—*Publisher*.

Christian Evidence

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

Christianity and Domestic Slavery

THE term "domestic slavery," as generally used, is not meant to qualify, in any particular, the essentially evil nature of enforced human servitude, but rather to describe a type of such servitude, existing from the beginning of history to comparatively recent times. Domestic slavery is to be distinguished, in its chattel character, from those forms of vassalage which, in various times and countries, have been known under the names of helotry, villenage, serfdom, peonage, and the like. It was especially distinguished, in their times of mutual existence, from that form of penal or constrained labor known as galley slavery, a subject discussed in our last month's paper. It is appropriate that the longer continuing should follow the other in the order of study.

Domestic slavery comes prominently into view in Bible history; and also it followed the history of most Christian countries down to dates not exceeding a century and a half ago. So embedded was it in the life of society, even Christian society, that for centuries it was considered a matter of course; and, at times, was rated as a divine institution, as was kingcraft; and as, at an earlier date, was also polygamous marriage. One who reads thoughtfully must be impressed with the extent to which domestic slavery and kingcraft have furnished similes for the highest forms and sentiments of literature, including that of the Scriptures themselves. This is of a necessity which cannot but suggest the delimited nature and powers of our human mentality, and also the law of progressive development in the understanding of truth. Will there come a time in the perfectionment of human life when we shall find not only "a new heaven and a new earth;" but also a new order of moral idealism for our thoughts?

It is one of the intellectual puzzles of life and history that Christianity should have wrought so long and, finally, so successfully for the extirpation of such abnormities as the

gladiatorial games and galley slavery before it turned to correct itself of the palpable inhumanity of domestic and chattel bondage; but the history exists as a fact, and not as a theory; and the brief space of a hundred years, counted backward from the end of slavery, will include every Christian community of the earth in the condemnation. Domestic slavery was the common sin of Christianity for, at least, sixteen hundred years of its historic responsibility, reckoning from the accession of Constantine, the first Christian emperor of Rome.

The Mosaic law recognized the existence of domestic slavery, and provided for its regulation, though mitigating its tenure in provisions made for the Sabbatical period and the year of Jubilee, when it was planned that normal freedom and other national readjustments should bring to new initials throughout the commonwealth of Israel. The terms and tenure of the Jubilee are somewhat obscure in the record; but it is evident that one of its objectives was to put a stigma on the institution of slavery by enhancing the interests of human freedom. Thus have many wrongs of the past been cured or combated by the strong and persistent implications of advancing truth. God and history move from sequence to sequence.

In the old covenant days, the evil of slavery was tolerated as a part of the economic-social system, just as were beverage drinking and plural marriage, matters which met the early and continuous opposition of Christianity; so that polygamy quickly disappeared under its ban, and slavery in a lengthened and final order; while drink, as marking a more subtle and individualistic appeal, has outlived both polygamy and slavery. A deal of comfort for the workers in our present campaign against drink and license should be derived from this history. So surely as Christianity is the supreme moral and spiritual force in the world; and so surely as it has extirpated polygamy, slavery, and many

kindred evils, so surely will it, in testimony of its own divineness, destroy the power of rum and license.

A record of slavery, particularly of that aspect of it which engages this study, has been elemental in human history since life began to express itself in forms of social and economic complexity. The monument writings of the most ancient peoples attest the existence of one or another form of servitude, generally as the result of captivity or reprisals in war. The Greeks early developed a system of slavery through their sea wide commerce, and through the petty wars which were waged by their several small states and political communities, both among themselves, and with the neighboring *ethne*, or barbarians. Helotry, a form of agrarian vassalage, to which reference already has been made, and which is directly credited to the Spartans, at one time, extensively prevailed throughout Attica and the Peloponessus; but the Athenians were always noted for the humanity with which they treated their bondmen. While all the philosophers, including Socrates and Plato, believed that slavery was right, and even beneficial to the enslaved, they looked at it from the Athenian view point, rather from that of even the wider Greek race.

In the times of the republic and the empire, Rome and Italy teemed with a slave population. These were both of the native Italian tribes and of foreign captives. In his eulogy over Julius Caesar dead, Mark Antony glories over the multitudes of captives which the living Caesar added to the thralls of Rome. The story of Spartacus vividly exhibits the immensity of the slave population of Southern Italy as early as 73 B.C., when that self emancipated Thracian slave leader was able to gather to his standard a hundred thousand slaves freed by his mandate; as he was able to recruit this army and hold it for the space of two years against the most illustrious generals of the empire.

Chiefly through the influence of its Greek and Roman background, and under the too easy interpretation of the Jewish temple law, Christian society, not to say the Christian Church, accepted domestic slavery as an institution. This is not to say that the New Testament writers coincided with this interpretation, or even made a record looking in this direction. The words of St. Paul may be taken as the gauge of the canon on the subject. Everywhere, he exhorts masters of

servants to show kindness, and servants he exhorts to obedience, not with "eye service, as men pleasers," but with that form of service which is from the heart. In the case of Onesimus, the fugitive slave of Philemon, the Christian layman and householder, St. Paul plainly shows a view of master and slave which outran his time and the state of world mind then prevailing. He treated his subject ideally, humanistically, and not with reference to the institution itself. This was not only the best way; but it was the only way, considering the times and the impinging pagan society to be challenged. In dealing with slavery, as with like things, which had a basis in contemporaneous civil law, the apostolic gospel seems to have proceeded with the thought that the ideal of the kingdom of God must work on the powers that be, and on the conscience of the civil realm, to bring them "into captivity to the obedience of Christ." But for the more obvious inhumanity connected with slavery St. Paul did have a bold and conclusive word. At I Timothy 1:10, he classes *men-stealing* with such abnormal and hateful offenses as murder, whoremongering, sodomy and sacrilege. It is certain that the apostolic mind was inimical to the institution of slavery.

A new form of slavery—and that form which has most sadly vexed the spirit of Christianity—appeared early in the sixteenth century, and reached its tragic climax only seven decades ago. For three centuries African slavery, with its attendant slave trade, was the nightmare of all Christendom; the ghost of orgies and horrors that blighted the romance of the New World's settlement; the entailment of an age of insurrection and war, leaving a heritage of distress which has been one of the major problems of mankind. Yet the way in which Christianity has met and dealt with this evil, and the way in which it is addressing itself to the aftermath of the same, is perpetual testimony to the divinity of its origin and the prophecy of its final victory.

Upon the Portuguese and the Spaniards seems to rest the approbrium of having originated the African slave trade, which gorged the new lands of America with a Negro slave population which, in some of these lands, especially those within, and bordering on, the Spanish Main, have remained in excess of the natives and Europeans. But the Portuguese and Spaniards did not long remain alone in this offense. Very quickly all

the Christian powers either authorized their subjects to engage in the nefarious and inhuman business, or else winked at their self-authorized entry. England, which was foremost in outlawing the trade, at one time, and that at the height of this "manstealing" commerce carried on under its flag, presented the anomaly of forbidding slavery on the soil of the homeland, but legalizing it in her colonies and protecting it on the seas. A particular infamy of the trade lay in the fact that it kept the African tribes in perpetual warfare, that captives might be supplied for the ships of the "blackbirders." An additional horror attended their transportation. The slave ships were floating pent houses, foul, infected, and often quickly the wooden graves of the unhappy creatures constituting their cargoes.

The situation in the New World which led to the beginning and development, on a large scale, of African slavery was, when the Portuguese and Spaniards undertook to enslave the native Indians for work in the mines and fields, they found them unable to endure the hardships of the tasks. In consequence they died by thousands, and soon the fields and mines were without laborers. It was then proposed to draw upon the black population of Africa to supply the lack. Las Casas, a Spanish priest, who went early to San Domingo, became the defender of the Indians against the cruelty of their enslavers. First to Ferdinand, and then to Charles V, he appealed, finally securing laws mitigating their condition. When the substitution of African slaves was proposed, Las Casas solemnly advocated the expedient, a thing which he afterwards bitterly regretted. Perhaps this was not the first instance of Negroes being transported to America; but it seems to have been the first importation on a commercial scale, and is regarded as the charter of the trade.

It was a natural consequence that Negro slavery should be introduced into the North American colonies, particularly, as in Virginia and the Carolinas the cultivation of cotton, rice and tobacco made it a source of instant profit. The first slaves bought by the English settler in North America were brought to Jamestown in 1619 by Dutch traders; but after that English ships became the purveyors. With the growth of colonial settlement, slavery was established in all parts of North America, from Massachusetts to Georgia. However, during the last decades

of the eighteenth century a strong anti-slavery sentiment grew up in most of the Northern colonies (later, States). Franklin, Jefferson, Madison and Jay were early advocates of emancipation. By 1821, slavery had become generally unpopular throughout the North. Already, it had been prohibited in the Northwest Territory; though it was recognized in the Constitution, and slave holders were made secure in the title to their slaves. One by one, the States of the North abolished the institution, though, in some of them, slave holding persisted well into the nineteenth century; while the early perfecting of Eli Whitney's cotton gin fixed it on the entire South as a long heritage of shame and distress.

The whole unhappy history of African slavery is too well known to need extended treatment. It is enough to say that, due, most largely to the English speaking peoples of the earth, all Christendom was brought into a concert for the complete and final abolition of slavery in every form. With the American Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, the freeing of the slaves in Brazil and of the serfs in Russia, the end of institutional bondage had come. While these ends were achieved more directly through civil processes, and through international diplomacies, the credit is none the less due to the naked spirit and teachings of the religion of the Nazarene, and will forever stand as a chief testimonial to the truth of the divine Word, which is its authority and charter.

Nashville, Tennessee.

A Testimony of the Night

JAMES J. BINGHAM

I gaze upon the wonders of the night;
My soul—the shining stars enthrall,
And speak in radiant gleamings of the Might
Divine, which silent moves among them all.

The whitened way of star-milk leads afar;
A clustered clan, the Pleiades outshine;
Arcturus, and the girded Orion, are
Arrayed in astral majesty sublime.

Each glistening orb seems ever to repeat,
In unvoiced rapture, with the pregnant sod,
The argument to foolish hearts defeat,
"We ARE—and thus we prove there is a
God."

Philadelphia

Life must be diverted from the things with
which Time deals, and centered on the timeless
things.

The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A., B.D.

Karl Barth and His Theology

PROFESSOR CARL BETZ of Wagner College, Rochester, N. Y., had a way of arousing enthusiasm in the dullest student for Greek and European history. I know this to be a fact, for I sat in his scholarly presence in the halls of learning for a period of five years. He was a father to all students, especially to those who had the ministry of the Gospel in view. He knew how to foster and to develop the positive Christian attitude. Many a young man went to him with perplexing questions about religion. Here he usually found answer and satisfaction. This was because Prof. Betz was not only a good pastor but also a scholarly minister of the Word. Steeped in the history of the past, he was the most up-to-date theologian we young men then knew. To this day there are few who are his peer on contemporary theology.

The Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Rochester, N. Y., asked Dr. Betz to deliver an address on a vital aspect of present day theology! "Karl Barth and His Theology." The paper was read March 28th. For the reason that I have been asked repeatedly about the theology of Karl Barth since his name appears often in this magazine, with his consent I will present some of the essential facts from Prof. Betz's address in this issue.

AT the close of the World War a young man made his appearance in Germany destined to create a sensation in the theological world of Protestant Germany. Indeed his name became rapidly well known in Scandinavia, Holland, England, and other countries. Karl Barth is a man with whom every evangelical minister and preacher should become acquainted because of his message and importance, which are equaled and surpassed only by Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Harnack in the nineteenth century.

Karl Barth was born at Basel, Switzerland in 1886. His was an atmosphere of theology, for his father was a professor in the Reformed Church and author of two useful books on the New Testament. As was becoming a Swiss, young Barth attended school at Berne; in due course of time entered the university there and continued his studies at Berlin, Tuebingen and Marburg. At Marburg he came under the influence of Wilhelm Hermann, whose book *Communion with God* is well known to English and American readers. The Neo-Kantian school at Marburg left its mark upon the philosoph-

ical outlook of Barth, and the radicalism of its theological bent under Johannes Weiss with its stress on "Interims-Ethik" and eschatology tinge all of Barth's thoughts. In his early twenties Barth assisted Martin Rade on the well known religious paper *Die alte Welt*. His two years in religious journalism helped Barth to forge a style which strikes home with great force.

Up until 1921 he was only active in writing and lecturing, but also occupied Reformed pulpits as pastor. Some of his addresses delivered during and after the war are to be found in the book translated later into English by the American Douglas Horton. It is entitled *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. It is the only book of Barth's done thus far into English.

In the year 1921 Barth was called to a professor's chair at Goettingen, Germany, to teach Reformed Theology. His chair is maintained by the American Reformed Church. In 1925 he was transferred to Muenster, then to the more important sphere to the University of Bonn. Thus Barth's public career has been passed almost entirely within the basin of the Rhine.

Karl Barth is a hard worker and a prolific writer. He flashed into the world of scholars with his commentary on Romans in 1919. He could have said with Lord Byron, "I woke one morning to find myself famous." It rapidly passed through five editions. Other books followed on other Biblical subjects. Under the title *Come, Creator, Spirit*, two volumes of sermons have been issued in collaboration with Thurneysen. In addition to the above Barth has been busy with the bi-monthly *Zwischen den Zeiten*, a periodical devoted to the new movement. Here Barth has gathered around him a band of writers who form what may be termed "The Barthian School."

The tremendous impression made by the writings of Barth has been deepened by the eloquence of Barth himself. He is much in

demand at retreats, ministers' fellowship gatherings, autumn assemblies. Admirers have described his addresses as in tone like those of an Old Testament Prophet. Everywhere he makes a deep impression by his caustic, searching diagnosis of the state of the Christian Churches generally. Some enthusiasts have hailed him as a "Young Luther."

What is the message of Karl Barth? It grew out of his practical ministry. He says, "Once in the ministry I found myself growing away from theological habits of thought and being forced back on the ministry problem: *the sermon*. I sought to find my way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the problem of the Bible on the other. As a minister I wanted to speak to the people on the infinite contradiction of their lives, but to speak on the not less infinite message of the Bible as much as a riddle as life." So from his practical work as preacher and his difficulties in preaching his theology, there grew up his theology of "Correction." The *Leitmotive* of his dogmatics resulted in this: *Doctrine is to be tested and regulated by preaching*. To quote, "Church preaching is the starting point and the practical end of dogmatics."

Barth's theology is not meant as a system. Seven years ago Barth disclaimed the title of "theology" for his conceptions. He says with devout Christian modesty, "I do not presume to put alongside of the great and venerable creators of theological systems anything equal or of like measure; it is rather a kind of a query in the margin; it is a pinch of cinnamon to flavor and to correct others." It is indeed refreshing in these days to hear a truly great Christian humbly objecting "that he is the founder of a 'school' at all." His own words are these, "So far as Thurneysen, Gogarten and I really form a 'school',—our work is superfluous."

However the past seven years have made a vast difference! For volumes that bear these names, *Sign Posts to Reconstruction* (the significant German word *Neubau*) of *Theology and Church*, the *Theology of Correction*, as he termed his thought in 1922, were bound to put the question mark upon nearly every present dominant idea in theological circles. Let it not be forgotten, that the criticisms of Barth come from every side: from Fundamentalists, Liberals, Ritschlians, religio-historicals and especially of the followers of the mystical schools of Otto and Heiler.

What are the sources of Karl Barth's theology? True to German openness of soul, he furnishes us with every detail. He tells us that his "ancestral line" runs back through Kierkegaard to Luther, Calvin and so to Paul and Jeremiah. It does *not* run back through Martensen and Erasmus. It does *not* include Schleiermacher. The very names Kierkegaard, Luther, Paul and Jeremiah suggest what Schleiermacher never possessed—namely, a clear and direct apprehension of the truth that *man is made to serve God and not God to serve man*. The negation and loneliness of Jeremiah's life, the keen and unrelenting opposition of Paul to religion as exemplified in Judaism, Luther's break with the piety of the Middle Ages, Kierkegaard's attack on Christianity—all are characteristic of a certain way of speaking with God, at which Schleiermacher never arrived. "The influence of Kierkegaard upon Barth and all the group around him is predominant. He says, 'I keep in mind always what Kierkegaard described as the infinitely qualitative difference between time and eternity, both in its negative and positive meaning.'

The names the message of Barth bear are significant: Theology of Crisis, Barthianism, Critical Theology, Dialectic Theology. *Barthianism*, because he is its guiding spirit and prophet; *Theology of Crisis*, because it came at a period when theology from a Christian viewpoint had reached a crisis and because the theology itself makes much of an eschatological crisis; *Critical Theology*, because it criticizes the religious method of its period; *Dialectic Theology*, because it is a method which finds truth to lie midway between the extremes of dogmatic assertion and critical denial. Barth himself likens his dialectic method to a narrow ledge on which "one must keep walking in order to avoid falling." This method naturally will prevent any theology from claiming to have absolute knowledge of God.

What are the chief elements of Barth's message? An infinite chasm separates God from man or rather man from God. The same is true with reference to the world of man and the world of God. God inhabits eternity while man's world is the time-world. These two worlds have nothing in common. A death line separates what is possible for man and what is possible for God. There is no bridge by which man can leap over this chasm. Man has tried it in religion. Religion is the attempt to find a direct way to God

which will always fail. "To be a religious man," Barth says, "is to be torn, a discordant, a restless man." But what man cannot do, God *can* and *has* done. He broke through into man's world by the miracle of Revelation. This revelation we have in Scripture, but *not* in the collection of 66 books, humanly and historically written, for the Bible is the literary monument of an ancient racial religion and of a Hellenistic cultus-religion of the Near East. It is a human document like any other, and as such it cannot lay an *a priori* claim to special attention and consideration." With such a view Barth can go and does go the limit in historical criticism. In this matter he is even more radical than Ritschlian theology. Where then does he find the Word of God in the Bible or God's Revelation? It is that which God speaks in our soul as we read the words of the Bible, for God only can speak His own word and can reveal its truth to us in our soul. Revelation is only *vertical*, from above, that is: God does not reveal Himself continuously and piecemeal in the life of this world. If we feel difficulties in view of such ideas of Barth about Revelation and the Bible, he would simply refer us to his dialectic paradox which prompted him to make these statements.

However, Barth speaks of grasping the contents of Scriptural Revelation and this by means of Faith. Yet Faith does not mean to Barth as it is usually understood, as knowledge of objective spiritual facts, truth, etc., but rather as the negation of everything human. It is a miracle, "a leap into the void." It is not the result of man seeking God, but rather the result of God's giving. It is the work of the Holy Spirit in those whom God has elected.

What is Barth's conception of God? God is to Barth the wholly or Altogether Other, the "totaliter aliter." Barth seems to conceive of this divine Otherness as both metaphysical and ethical, although he does not say so outright. Barth speaks of God as the "mysterium tremendum." All modern religion which conceives of man as seeking and finding God is a mere illusion. God is simply unknowable, because He is transcendent and unknowable. Even Revelation does not remove the cloud that veils Him. Faith in God may be defined according to Barth as "a respect for the divine Incognito." There is thus no way from man to God.

But if religion cannot find a way from man to God, there is a way from God to

man. That way is Jesus Christ. He is the explanation of the riddle of life which religion has been attempting vainly to solve. Christ is the remover of the sting of death which religion could make only more emphatic. Christ is the revelation of that righteousness of God which religion has sought and will continue to seek in vain. But at the same time Christ is also the very condemnation of human possibility to attain God's righteousness and holiness. Here the dialectic is brought into play again, namely, so that he makes a distinction in Jesus Christ between his human and divine natures. According to Barth Jesus is merely a temporal being, His humanity or flesh means very little to us. Hence it is of little importance, whether the facts of Christ's life are recorded correctly in the Gospels. Even the resurrection is no historical datum, *i. e.* historically true. As an event in history it is open to question and may be resolved into a myth. For the real resurrection of Jesus lies beyond time and space. Yet through this imperfect, human, historical Jesus, who was conditioned by His environment as we are, there shines forth the miraculous fact of God's Word of redemption to man. Through Jesus we can see that in spite of His majesty God is love. The barrier between man and God has been bridged but from the God-ward side. In spite of His majesty and transcendence God stoops to lift fallen man out of his hopeless despair. And thus it remains true: man is justified by Faith alone. This key word of the Reformation is emphasized by Barth as well as the other: although as sinners we are justified.

We are now prepared to inquire concerning the Barthian idea of salvation. Salvation means to him as to us a new relation of the individual to God, the Altogether Other-worldly and transcendental God. This relation, however, God alone can establish and this He does in what Barth calls *crisis*. This is a technical term for God's action in the soul of man. Compared with other social-religious experiences this experience of the crisis is the only real experience we can have. However, only too often God and His crisis are thrust into the background and made impossible by religious ritual, preaching, praying, Bible reading, creed recitation, social service, etc. There human activities tainted through and through with sin tend to become a substitute for God and the crisis he effects in the soul. Barth believes in total depravity.

Probably a few critical remarks would be in order. It is no doubt too early to estimate the lasting effects of this New Calvinism upon theology and the Church. Yet some definite statements can be made regarding this theology. Its success is due to a large extent to the dissatisfaction with the religio-historical school. Adherents of the school looked and longed for something new: a theology which was *not* anthropology but real *theology*, although critics maintain that this is only apparently so, and not real and essentially so. Again, it is granted that Barthianism has become so important for *our time*, because it took up the battle with all forms of psychological and historical empiricism as of a shallow humanism. In this battle it emphasizes the often forgotten truths: God must be taken seriously, even today. The modern concepts or ideas of God are to a marked degree inadequate and insufficient. We must reconsider the seriousness of human destiny. Furthermore, Barthianism is a timely protest against the pride and presumption of modern man. It renews the idea of Revelation, *i. e.* stresses the fact of divine initiative. Although Barth reasserts in a rather pointed and extreme manner the paradoxical nature of religion, he makes known the need of religion and theology, of the going beyond the rational to the irrational. In addition to these truths Barth must be given credit for having undertaken again the task of solving the *relation of reason to revelation*. Although not having solved it he put it up anew for discussion showing at the same time the hidden rocks which a modern positive theology based on Scripture must avoid.

Over against these points of merit we must set what we consider the general weaknesses of Barthianism. Barth's theology develops a radical dualism, the philosophical basis of which tends to bring it into the very

pessimism which Barth so very earnestly tries to escape. The Barthian conception of God is too Calvinistic: God is so far removed from the world that He becomes virtually unknowable. There is an unsatisfactory break between the historical Jesus and the risen Christ. Barth follows here the extreme theory of Albert Schweitzer as to the person of Jesus who with others removed all historical foundations for Christology.

The Lutheran reaction has been on the whole *negative*. This is no cause for surprise to us when we recall that Barth's theology is predominately based on the old Calvinism, now in the form of a Neo-Calvinism. Similarly Barth and his followers base their theological conclusions *not* wholly on the Word of God as did Luther, but partially on their own reason. They give themselves over to speculations and philosophizing about the great things of salvation, faith, etc. Therefore Barth falls under the verdict of Luther, *Omnis speculator figulus est et fingit quod in veritate non est* (Every theologian who proceeds from his reasoning is a potter, who shapes something which in truth does not exist).

In contrast to such theologians Luther took his position squarely on the Word of God. Hence the claim of the Barthians that their leader is a spiritual son of the Reformation or a modern renewer of Reformation theology cannot be admitted. An eminent Lutheran theologian of Germany succinctly says, "I now can see in Barth only a danger for our Church."

My personal opinion is this: In Luther we have the great historic realities of Holy Scripture, in Barth, who, too, burns with sincerity, we after all are dealing with the products of his own speculations and philosophy.

Wilmington, Delaware

From a Missionary

I WISH to express my great appreciation of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. I know of nothing just like it, and I am never satisfied until I have read the last word of each new issue.

Such a work as your magazine does, cannot be accomplished by the large majority of religious magazines, because they also have the propaganda feature of the societies for whose interests they are published.

I trust the magazine will continue to be heartily supported, and will find a place in the study of every Evangelical pastor.

THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.

I. M. HARGETT, D.D.

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.

MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.

WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK

THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

The Meaning of Christian Consecration

REVEREND JOSEPH T. LARSEN

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.—Rom. 12:1, 2.

UNDOUBTEDLY this is the most direct statement about Christian consecration in the whole Bible. Much so-called consecration is too shallow and unreal. Strictly speaking, no mortal may fully consecrate himself or herself. We may *dedicate* our all to God, to Christ, or His cause, but we do not consecrate our selves by our own will, or ability; it is God that consecrates after we dedicate our wills, our hearts, our lives, and our bodies to Him. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice,"—that is dedication. God accepting and completing the work may be termed consecration. Heb. 7:28 shows that "the Son is consecrated forevermore."

Lincoln in his Gettysburg address said, "We cannot consecrate . . . this ground." He seemed to have understood this truth at least from that sacred mission which he then held.

Dedication, then, means turning over to God everything pertaining to ourselves, our service, and our future. Someone in a recent magazine gave this fine dedication:

Oh, Lord, I present myself to Thee: my will, my time, my talents, my tongue, my property, my reputation, my entire being,—to be and to do anything thou requirest of me. Now as I have given myself to Thee, I am no longer my own, but all the Lord's. I believe that thou wilt accept the offering I bring. I trust Thee to work in me all the good pleasure of thy will. I am willing to receive what thou givest, to lack what thou withholdest, to relinquish what thou takest, to surrender what thou claimest, to suffer what thou ordainest, to do what thou commandest, to wait till thou sayest go!

This is real dedication if really entered into by will and heart. God accepts this dedication and then He consecrates us to Himself for life, for service, and *forever!*

But there may be also many surrenders

and dedications within the dedication. Parents may dedicate their children to God for His service. Men of means may dedicate wealth recently acquired to God's cause. New talents, money, children, property, and opportunities, calls for new and fuller dedication, lest one should become selfish, self-willed, or self-satisfied.

Paul's words are addressed to "Brethren." That implies conversion, and a participation in the mercies of God. If it were not for His mercies where would we be? To present the body, may also imply a surrender of the soul, spirit, and mind, within the body. This must be presented "a living sacrifice"—alive unto God but dead unto sin, self, and the worldly demands. The body must be holy by means of separation unto God and from sin, until it becomes acceptable unto God, being made conformable to Christ's image. This, Paul says, "is your reasonable service."

This consecration, or "reasonable service," will cause us to become unlike the world (not conformed), transformed by the Spirit of God into a new mind, even the mind of Christ. Then we shall prove or really experience before God and men "what is the good, acceptable, and perfect will of God."

The results of the consecration will be seen in what follows in this chapter: Humility, good sense, soberness, faith, happy relationship, preaching of the Gospel, ministering to the saints, teaching the Word, exhortation, giving, ruling as from the Lord, and mercy with cheerfulness (vs. 3-8).

That will be the results in actual service for God and fellowmen. With relationship to those within, the consecrated saint of God will have pure love, without hypocrisy. There will be an abhorrence of evil, and a cleaving to the good. There will be tender affection, with a Christian brotherly love. There will be fervency of spirit, no slothfulness of business, highest service to the Lord. Much joy, patience, with tribulation, and more prayer will be evident.

The truly consecrated person shows hospitality, generosity, and blesses instead of curses; rejoices with the joyful, weeps with the sorrowful; and shows a sympathetic mind, and condescends to men of humble life.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Meddlesome Helpfulness

JOHN H. JOWETT, D.D.

I have you in my heart.—Phil. 1:7.

GEORGE MACDONALD somewhere makes a striking contrast between meddlesomeness and helpfulness. He is describing some nobleman who was ever ready to help his fellowmen: and he adds this arresting word to his description: "And so he refrained from meddling." I suppose that the difference is just this: meddlesomeness is well-meant aggressiveness; helpfulness is thoughtful hospitality. When I am meddlesome I force my brother's door to obtain an entrance; when I am helpful, I open my own door and offer bountiful entertainment to my brother. One is clumsy kindness; the other is wise and delicate kindness. One is fussy and undiscerning, the other is considerate and serene.

I would describe vital helpfulness as the hospitality of the large heart. The helpful folk are those who are constantly enlarging the roominess of their hearts, and welcoming and entertaining a larger company of guests. However many guests there may be, there is no suggestion of being crowded, and there is always room for more. These are noble entertainers. Their sympathies are always larger than the necessities which call at their doors; and the meats and delicacies upon their tables are offered with such luring and gentle courtesy that the guest is almost made to feel that he is the host and the giver, rather than the receiver. I recall such a man who helped me in my college days. His helpfulness came again and again into my life, and it came as gently and unobtrusively as the angel-ministry in the days of the apostles. There was no fuss, no noise, no rattling of a purse. I just found a table spread in the wilderness, and the one who had done it came in as it were on tiptoe, and I scarcely heard a sound. And when years afterward I spoke to him about it, the good soul had forgotten it altogether, for his life was spent in such ministries.

This quiet hospitality of the open heart was one of the stalwart virtues of the apostle

Paul. "I have you in my heart." And this must be one of the shining distinctions of every disciple of Christ. Money may play little or no part in the ministry. It is often most needed where there is an abundance of money. In many a rich man's life, and still more in many a rich woman's life, there is an aching need for the healing hospitality of a great and understanding heart. And the helpful heart, just because it is wise and roomy, is great in its discernments, and men and women are helped by just being understood. God gave unto Solomon "largeness of heart." It was his choicest gift.

The Unselfish God

C. C. ALBERTSON, D.D.

For he shall not speak of himself.—John 16:13.

ONE of the characteristics of a selfish soul is the inclination to speak of himself immoderately, if not exclusively. The great model of unselfishness is God. The Old Testament is full of the unfolding doctrine of a coming Christ. The Father speaks not of himself, but of his Son. At last the Son came, but he did not speak of himself. He revealed the Father, and spoke of Another, a Comforter, to come. The Comforter came on the Day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit, true to the prophecy of Christ, spoke not of himself, but took of the things of Christ and showed them unto us. Each of the three Persons of the Trinity reveals the other. Is not this the office of the minister of Christ—not to speak of himself but of Another? It was so with John the Baptist, whose motto was, "He must increase, and I must decrease."

The only way to get out of the ever-present consciousness of self is to get into the ever-present consciousness of union with Christ. His life is the perfect type of unselfishness. To use a phrase of Sidney Lanier, it is Jesus who leads the world in "selfless chivalry." A great college president used to exhort his students often, "I beseech you, resist the tyranny of self, accept duty as the law of life, and live in the will of God." It would be difficult to imagine a more perfect counsel, and it had its effect upon innumerable lives. The Christian religion is emphatic upon this point. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth." "Seek not great things for yourselves." Not until Life's center shifts from self to other-self have we begun to learn the meaning of the Master's mind.

Current Religious Thought

The Higher Criticism

CANON DYSON HAGUE, M.A., D.D.*

Some years ago I published a series of articles on the Higher Critics and the Higher Criticism which were widely read and were republished in a somewhat abridged form in the first volume of the Fundamentals. They are now sent forth without any considerable alteration with the prayer that God may still use them to stablish, strengthen, settle believers in the old, old faith.—DYSON HAGUE.

Chapter II

A Discredited Old Testament

AS to the rest of the Old Testament, it may be briefly said that they have dealt with it with an equally confusing hand. The time-honored traditions of the Catholic Church are set at naught, and its thesis of the relation of inspiration and genuineness and authenticity derided. As to the Psalms, the harp that was once believed to be the harp of David was not handled by the sweet Psalmist of Israel, but generally by some anonymous post-exilist; and Psalms that are ascribed to David by the omniscient Lord Himself are daringly attributed to some anonymous Maccabean. Ecclesiastes, written, nobody knows, when, where, and by whom, possesses just a possible grade of inspiration, though one of the critics "of cautious and well-balanced judgment" denies that it contains any at all. "Of course," says another, "it is not really the work of Solomon" (Driver, *Introduction*, p.470). The Song of Songs is an idyl of human love, and nothing more. There is no inspiration in it; it contributes nothing to the sum of revelation (Sanday, p.211). Esther, too, adds nothing to the sum of revelation, and is not historical (p.213). Isaiah was, they say, written by a number of authors. The first part, chapters 1 to 40, by Isaiah; the second by a Deutero-Isaiah and a number of anonymous authors. As to Daniel, it was a purely pseudonymous work, written probably in the second century B.C.

With regard to the New Testament: The English writing schools have hitherto confined themselves mainly to the Old Testament, but if Professor Sanday, who passes as a most conservative and moderate representative of the critical school, can be taken as a sample, the historical books are

Yet in the first instance strictly histories, put together by ordinary historical methods, or, in so far as the methods on which they are composed, are not ordinary, due rather to the peculiar circumstances of the case, and not to influences, which need be specially described as supernatural (p.399).

The Second Epistle of Peter is pseudonymous, its name counterfeit, and, therefore, a forgery, just as large parts of Isaiah, Zechariah and Jonah, and Proverbs were supposititious and quasi-fraudulent documents. This is a straightforward statement of the position taken by what is called the moderate school of Higher Criticism. It is their own admitted position, according to their own writings.

The difficulty, therefore, that presents itself to the average man of today is this: How can these critics still claim to believe in the Bible as the Christian Church has ever believed it?

A Discredited Bible

There can be no doubt that Christ and His Apostles accepted the whole of the Old Testament as inspired in every portion of every part; from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Malachi, all was implicitly believed to be the very Word of God Himself. And ever since their day the view of the Universal Christian Church has been that the Bible is the Word of God; as the twentieth article of the Anglican Church terms it, it is God's Word written. The Bible as a whole is inspired. "All that is written is God-inspired." That is, the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God; it is the Word of God. It contains a revelation. "All is not revealed, but all is inspired." This is the conservative and, up to the present day, the almost universal view of the question.

* Rector of the Memorial Church, London, Ontario. Lecturer in liturgics and ecclesiology, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada. Examining chaplain to the bishop of Huron.

There are, it is well known, many theories of inspiration. But whatever view or theory of inspiration men may hold, plenary, verbal, dynamical, mechanical, superintendent, or governmental, they refer either to the inspiration of the men who wrote, or to the inspiration of what is written. In one word, they imply throughout the work of God the Holy Ghost, and are bound up with the concomitant ideas of authority, veracity, reliability, and truth divine. (The two strongest works on the subject from this standpoint are by Gaussen and Lee. Gaussen on the Theopneustia is published in an American edition by Hitchcock & Walden, of Cincinnati; and Lee on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture is published by Rivingtons. Bishop Wordsworth, on the *Inspiration of the Bible*, is also very scholarly and strong (Rivingtons, 1875).

The Bible can no longer, according to the critics, be viewed in this light. It is not the Word in the old sense of that term. It is not the Word of God in the sense that all of it is given by the inspiration of God. It simply *contains* the Word of God. In many of its parts it is just as uncertain as any other human book. It is not even reliable history. Its records of what it does narrate as ordinary history are full of falsifications and blunders. The origin of Deuteronomy, *e. g.*, was "a consciously refined falsification" (See Möller, p.207).

The Real Difficulty

But do they still claim to believe that the Bible is inspired? Yes. That is, in a measure. As Dr. Driver says in his preface, "Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament; it pre-supposes it." That is perfectly true. Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars is safe. But the preponderating scholarship in Old Testament criticism has admittedly *not* been in the hands of men who could be described as Christian scholars. It has been in the hands of men who disavow belief in God and Jesus Christ Whom He sent. Criticism in the hands of Horne and Hengstenberg does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament. But, in the hands of Spinoza, and Graf, and Wellhausen, and Kuenen, inspiration is neither pre-supposed nor possible. Dr. Briggs and Dr. Smith may avow earnest avowals of belief in the Divine character of the Bible, and Dr. Driver may assert that critical conclusions

do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but from first to last, they treat God's Word with an indifference almost equal to that of the Germans. They certainly handle the Old Testament as if it were ordinary literature. And in all their theories they seem like plastic wax in the hands of the rationalistic moulders. But they still claim to believe in Biblical inspiration.

A Revolutionary Theory

Their theory of inspiration must be, then, a very different one from that held by the average Christian.

In the Bampton Lectures for 1903, Professor Sanday of Oxford, as the exponent of the later and more conservative school of Higher Criticism, came out with a theory which he termed the inductive theory. It is not easy to describe what is fully meant by this, but it appears to mean the presence of what they call "a divine element" in certain parts of the Bible. What that really is he does not accurately declare. The language always vapors off into the vague and indefinite, whenever he speaks of it. In what books it is he does not say. "It is present in different books and parts of books in different degrees." "In some the Divine element is at the maximum; in others at the minimum." He is not always sure. He is sure it is not in Esther, in Ecclesiastes, in Daniel. If it is in the historical books, it is there as conveying a religious lesson rather than as a guarantee of historic veracity, rather as interpreting than as narrating. At the same time, if the histories as far as textual construction was concerned were "natural processes carried out naturally," it is difficult to see where the Divine or supernatural element comes in. It is an inspiration which seems to have been devised as a hypothesis of compromise. In fact, it is a tenuous, equivocal, and indeterminate something, the amount of which is as indefinite as its quality (Sanday, pp.100-398; cf. Driver, Preface, ix).

But its most serious feature is this: It is a theory of inspiration that completely overturns the old-fashioned ideas of the Bible and its unquestioned standard of authority and truth. For whatever this so-called Divine element is, it appears to be quite consistent with defective argument, incorrect interpretation, if not what the average man would call forgery or falsification.

It is, in fact, revolutionary. To accept it the Christian will have to completely readjust his ideas of honor and honesty, of falsehood and misrepresentation. Men used to think that forgery was a crime, and falsification a sin. Pusey, in his great work on Daniel, said that

To write a book under the name of another and to give it out to be his in any case a forgery, dishonest in itself and destructive of all trustworthiness (Pusey, *Lectures on Daniel*, p.1).

But according to the Higher Critical position, all sorts of pseudonymous material, and not a little of it believed to be true by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, is to be found in the Bible, and no antecedent objection ought to be taken to it.

Men used to think that inaccuracy would affect reliability and that proven inconsistencies would imperil credibility. But now it appears that there may not only be mistakes and errors on the part of copyists, but forgeries, intentional omissions, and misinterpretations on the part of authors, and yet, marvelous to say, faith is not to be destroyed, but to be placed on a firmer foundation (Sanday, p.122). They have, according to Briggs, enthroned the Bible in a higher position than ever before (Briggs, *The Bible, Church and Reason*, p.149). Sanday admits that there is an element in the Pentateuch derived from Moses himself. An element! But he adds,

However much we may believe that there is a genuine Mosaic foundation in the Pentateuch, it is difficult to lay the finger upon it, and to say with confidence, here Moses himself is speaking. . . . The strictly Mosaic element in the Pentateuch must be indeterminate. . . . We ought not, perhaps, to use them (the visions of Ex.3 and 33) without reserve for Moses himself (pp.172, 174, 176).

The ordinary Christian, however, will say: Surely if we deny the Mosaic authorship and the unity of the Pentateuch we must undermine its credibility. The Pentateuch claims to be Mosaic. It was the universal tradition of the Jews. It is expressly stated in nearly all the subsequent books of the Old Testament. The Lord Jesus said so most explicitly (John 5:46,47).

If Not Moses, Who?

For this thought must surely follow to the thoughtful man: If Moses did not write the Books of Moses, who did?

If there were three or four, or six, or nine authorized original writers, why not fourteen, or sixteen, or nineteen? And then an-

other and more serious thought must follow that. Who were these original writers, and who originated them? If there were manifest evidences of alterations, manipulations, inconsistencies and omissions by an indeterminate number of unknown and unknowable and undateable redactors, then the question arises, who were these redactors, and how far had they authority to redact, and who gave them this authority? If the redactor was the writer, was he an inspired writer, and if he was inspired, what was the degree of his inspiration; was it partial, plenary, inductive or indeterminate? This is a question of questions: What is the guarantee of the inspiration of the redactor, and who is its guarantor? Moses we know, and Samuel we know, and Daniel we know, but ye anonymous and pseudonymous, who are ye? The Pentateuch, with Mosaic authorship, as Scriptural, divinely accredited, is upheld by Catholic tradition and scholarship, and appeals to reason. But a mutilated cento or scrap-book of anonymous compilations, with its pre- and post-exilic redactors and redactions, is confusion worse confounded.

At least that is the way it appears to the average Christian. He may not be an expert in philosophy or theology, but his common sense must surely be allowed its rights. And that is the way it appears, too, to such an illustrious scholar and critic as Dr. Emil Reich (*Contemporary Review*, April, 1905, p.515).

It is not possible then to accept the Kuenen-Wellhausen theory of the structure of the Old Testament and the Sanday-Driver theory of its inspiration without undermining faith in the Bible as the Word of God. For the Bible is either the Word of God, or it is not. The children of Israel were the children of the Only Living and True God, or they were not. If their Jehovah was a mere tribal deity, and their religion a human evolution; if their sacred literature was natural with mythical and pseudonymous admixtures; then the Bible is dethroned from its throne as the exclusive, authoritative, Divinely inspired Word of God. It simply ranks as one of the sacred books of the ancients with similar claims of inspiration and revelation. Its inspiration is an indeterminate quantity and any man has a right to subject it to the judgment of his own critical insight, and to receive just as much of it as inspired as he or some other person believes to be in-

spired. When the contents have passed through the sieve of his judgment the inspired residuum may be large, or the inspired residuum may be small. If he is a conservative critic it may be fairly large, a maximum; if he is a more advanced critic it may be fairly small, a minimum. It is simply the ancient literature of a religious people containing somewhere the Word of God;

A revelation of no one knows what, made no one knows how, and lying no one knows where, except that it is to be somewhere between Genesis and Revelation, but probably to the exclusion of both (Pusey, Daniel, xxviii).

No Final Authority

Another serious consequence of the Higher Critical movement is that it threatens the Christian system of doctrine and the whole fabric of systematic theology. For up to the present time any text from any part of the Bible was accepted as a proof-text for the establishment of any truth of Christian teaching, and a statement from the Bible was considered an end of controversy. The doctrinal systems of the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Methodist and other Churches are all based upon the view that the Bible contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (See 39 Articles Church of England, vi, ix, xx, etc.). They accept as an axiom that the Old and New Testaments in part, and as a whole, have been given and sealed by God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. All the doctrines of the Church of Christ, from the greatest to the least, are based on this. All the proofs of the doctrines are based also on this. No text was questioned; no book was doubted; all Scripture was received by the great builders of our theological systems with that unassailable belief in the inspiration of its texts, which was the position of Christ and His apostles.

But now the Higher Critics think they have changed all that.

They claim that the science of criticism has dispossessed the science of systematic theology. Canon Henson tells us that the day has gone by for proof-texts and harmonies. It is not enough now for a theologian to turn to a book in the Bible, and bring out a text in order to establish a doctrine. It might be in a book, or in a portion of the Book that the German critics have proved to be a forgery, or an anachronism. It might be in Deuteronomy, or in Jonah, or in Daniel, and in that

case, of course, it would be out of the question to accept it. The Christian system, therefore, will have to be re-adjusted if not revolutionized, every text and chapter and book will have to be inspected and analyzed in the light of its date, and origin, and circumstances, and authorship, and so on, and only after it has passed the examining board of the modern Franco-Dutch-German criticism will it be allowed to stand as proof-text for the establishment of any Christian doctrine!

But the most serious consequence of this theory of the structure and inspiration of the Old Testament is that it overturns the juridic authority of our Lord Jesus Christ.

What of Christ's Authority?

The attitude of Christ to the Old Testament Scriptures must determine ours. He is God. He is truth. His is the final voice. He is the Supreme Judge. There is no appeal from that court. Christ Jesus the Lord believed and affirmed the historic veracity of the whole of the Old Testament writings implicitly (Luke 24:44). And the Canon, or collection of Books of the Old Testament, was precisely the same in Christ's time as it is today. And further. Christ Jesus our Lord believed and emphatically affirmed the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (Matt. 5:17,18; Mark 12:26-36; Luke 16:31; John 5:46,47). That is true, the critics say. But, then, neither Christ nor His Apostles were critical scholars! Perhaps not in the twentieth century sense of the term. But, as a German scholar said, if they were not *critici doctores*, they were *doctores veritatis* who did not come into the world to fortify popular errors by their authority. But then they say, Christ's knowledge as man was limited. He grew in knowledge (Luke 2:52). Surely that implies His ignorance. And if His ignorance, why not His ignorance with regard to the science of historical criticism (Gore, *Lux Mundi*, p.360; Briggs, H. C. of *Hexateuch*, p.28)? Or even if He did know more than His age, He probably spoke as He did in accommodation with the ideas of His contemporaries (Briggs, p.29)!

In fact, what they mean is practically that Jesus did know perfectly well that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but allowed His disciples to believe that Moses did, and taught His disciples that Moses did, simply because He did not want to upset their simple faith in the whole of the Old Testament

as the actual and authoritative and Divinely revealed Word of God (See Driver, p.12). Or else, that Jesus imagined, like any other Jew of His day, that Moses wrote the books that bear his name, and believed, with the childlike Jewish belief of His day, the literal inspiration, Divine authority and historic veracity of the Old Testament, and yet was completely mistaken, ignorant of the simplest facts, and wholly in error. In other words, He could not tell a forgery from an original, or a pious fiction from a genuine document. (The analogy of Jesus speaking of the sun rising as an instance of the theory of accommodation is a very different thing).

This, then, is their position: Christ knew the views He taught were false, and yet taught them as truth. Or else, Christ didn't know they were false and believed them to be true when they were not true. In either case the Blessed One is dethroned as True God and True Man. If He did not know the books to be spurious when they were spurious and the fables and myths to be mythical and fabulous; if He accepted legendary tales as trustworthy facts, then He was not and is not omniscient. He was not only intellectually fallible, He was morally fallible; for He was not true enough "to miss the ring of truth" in Deuteronomy and Daniel.

And further. If Jesus did know certain of the books to be lacking in genuineness, if not spurious and pseudonymous, if He did know the stories of the Fall and Lot and Abraham and Jonah and Daniel to be allegorical and imaginary, if not unverifiable and mythical, then He was neither trustworthy nor good. "If it were not so, I would have told you." We feel, those of us who love and trust Him, that if these stories were not true, if these books were a mass of historical unveracities, if Abraham was an eponymous hero, if Joseph was an astral myth, that He would have told us so. It is a matter that concerned His honor as a Teacher as well as His knowledge as our God. As Canon Liddon has conclusively pointed out, if our Lord was unreliable in these historic and documentary matters of inferior value, how can He be followed as the teacher of doctrinal truth and the revealer of God (John 3:12)? (Liddon, *Divinity of Our Lord*, pp.475-480).

After the Kenosis

Men say in this connection that part of

the humiliation of Christ was His being touched with the infirmities of our human ignorance and fallibilities. They dwell upon the so-called doctrine of the Kenosis, or the emptying, as explaining satisfactorily His limitations. But Christ spoke of the Old Testament Scriptures after His resurrection. He affirmed after His glorious resurrection that

All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me (Luke 24:44).

This was not a statement made during the time of the Kenosis, when Christ was a mere boy, or a youth, or a mere Jew after the flesh (I Cor.13:11). It is the statement of Him Who has been declared the Son of God with power. It is the Voice that is final and overwhelming. The limitations of the Kenosis are all abandoned now, and yet the Risen Lord not only does not give a shadow of a hint that any statement in the Old Testament is inaccurate or that any portion thereof needed revision or correction, not only most solemnly declared that those books which we receive as the product of Moses were indeed the books of Moses, but authorized with His Divine imprimatur the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures from beginning to end.

There are, however, two or three questions that must be raised, as they will have to be faced by every student of present day problems. The first is this: Is not refusal of the higher critical conclusions mere opposition to light and progress and the position of ignorant alarmists and obscurantists?

Not Obscurantists

It is very necessary to have our minds made perfectly clear on this point, and to remove not a little dust of misunderstanding.

The desire to receive all the light that the most fearless search for truth by the highest scholarship can yield is the desire of every true believer in the Bible. No really healthy Christian mind can advocate obscurantism. The obscurant who opposes the investigation of scholarship, and would throttle the investigators, has not the spirit of Christ. In heart and attitude he is a Mediævalist. To use Bushnell's famous apologue, he would try to stop the dawning of the day by wringing the neck of the crowing cock. No one wants to put the Bible in a glass case. But it is the duty of every Christian who belongs to the noble army of truth-lovers to test all things and to hold fast that which is good. He also

has rights even though he is, technically speaking, unlearned, and to accept any view that contradicts his spiritual judgment simply because it is that of a so-called scholar, is to abdicate his franchise as a Christian and his birthright as a man (See that excellent little work by Professor Kennedy, *Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned*, F. H. Revell Co.). And in his right of private judgment he is aware that while the privilege of investigation is conceded to all, the conclusions of an avowedly prejudiced scholarship must be subjected to a peculiarly searching analysis. The most ordinary Bible reader is learned enough to know that the investigation of the Book that claims to be supernatural by those who are avowed enemies of all that is supernatural, and the study of subjects that can be understood only by men of humble and contrite heart by men who are admittedly irreverent in spirit, must certainly be received with caution (See Parker's striking work, *None Like It*, F. H. Revell Co., and his last address).

The Scholarship Argument

The second question is also serious: Are we not bound to receive these views when they are advanced, not by rationalists, but by Christians, and not by ordinary Christians, but by men of superior and unchallengeable scholarship?

There is a widespread idea among younger men that the so-called Higher Critics must be followed because their scholarship settles the questions. This is a great mistake. No expert scholarship can settle questions that require a humble heart, a believing mind and a reverent spirit, as well as a knowledge of Hebrew and philology; and no scholarship can be relied upon as expert which is manifestly characterized by a biased judgment, a curious lack of knowledge of human nature, and a still more curious deference to the views of men with a prejudice against the supernatural. No one can read such a suggestive and sometimes even such an inspiring writer as George Adam Smith without a feeling of sorrow that he has allowed this German bias of mind to lead him into such an assumption of infallibility in many of his positions and statements. It is the same with Driver. With a kind of *sic volo sic jubeo* airy ease he introduces assertions and propositions that would really require chapter after

chapter, if not even volume after volume, to substantiate. On page after page his "must be," and "could not possibly be," and "could certainly not," extort from the average reader the natural exclamation: "But why?" "Why not?" "Wherefore?" "On what grounds?" "For what reason?" "Where are the proofs?" But of proofs or reason there is not a trace. The reader must be content with the writer's assertions. It reminds one, in fact, of the "we may well suppose," and "perhaps" of the Darwinian who offers as the sole proof of the origination of a different species his random supposition (*Modern Ideas of Evolution*, Dawson, pp.53-55)!

A Great Mistake

There is a widespread idea also among the younger students that because Graf and Wellhausen and Driver and Cheyne are experts in Hebrew that, therefore, their deductions as experts in language must be received. This, too, is a mistake. There is no such difference in the Hebrew of the so-called original sources of the Hexateuch as some suppose. The argument from language, says Professor Bissell (*Introduction to Genesis in Colors*, p.vii), requires extreme care for obvious reasons. There is no visible cleavage line among the supposed sources. Any man of ordinary intelligence can see at once the vast difference between the English of Tennyson and Shakespeare, and Chaucer and Sir John de Mandeville. But no scholar in the world ever has or ever will be able to tell the dates of each and every book in the Bible by the style of the Hebrew (See Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*, p.109). The unchanging Orient knows nothing of the swift lingual variations of the Occident. Pusey, with his masterly scholarship, has shown how even the Book of Daniel, from the standpoint of philology, cannot possibly be a product of the time of the Maccabees (*On Daniel*, pp.23-59). The late Professor of Hebrew in the University of Toronto, Professor Hirschfelder, in his very learned work on Genesis, says: "We would search in vain for any peculiarity either in the language or the sense that would indicate a two-fold authorship." As far as the language of the original goes, "the most fastidious critic could not possibly detect the slightest peculiarity that would indicate it to be derived from two sources" (p.72). Dr. Emil Reich also, in his *Bankruptcy of the Higher*

Criticism, in the Contemporary Review, April, 1905, says the same thing.

Not All on One Side

A third objection remains, a most serious one. It is that all the scholarship is on one side. The old-fashioned conservative views are no longer maintained by men with pretension to scholarship. The only people who oppose the Higher Critical views are the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the illiterate (Briggs' *Bible, Church and Reason*, pp.240-247).

This, too, is a matter that needs a little clearing up. In the first place it is not fair to assert that the upholders of what are called the old-fashioned or traditional views of the Bible are opposed to the pursuit of scientific Biblical investigation. It is equally unfair to imagine that their opposition to the views of the Continental school is based upon ignorance and prejudice.

What the Conservative school oppose is not Biblical criticism, but Biblical criticism by rationalists. They do not oppose the conclusions of Wellhausen and Kuenen because they are experts and scholars; they oppose them because the Biblical criticism of rationalists and unbelievers can be neither expert nor scientific. A criticism that is characterized by the most arbitrary conclusions from the most spurious assumptions has no right to the word scientific. And further. Their adhesion to the traditional views is not only conscientious but intelligent. They believe that the old-fashioned views are as scholarly as they are Scriptural. It is the fashion in some quarters to cite the imposing list of scholars on the side of the German school, and to sneeringly assert that there is not a scholar to stand up for the old views of the Bible.

This is not the case. Hengstenberg of Basle and Berlin, was as profound a scholar as Eichhorn, Vater or De Wette; and Keil or Kurtz, and Zahn and Rupperecht were competent to compete with Reuss and Kuenen. Wilhelm Möller, who confesses that he was once "immovably convinced of the irrefutable correctness of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis," has revised his former radical conclusions on the ground of reason and deeper research as a Higher Critic; and Professor Winckler, who has of late overturned the assured and settled results of the Higher Critics from the foundations, is, according

to Orr, the leading Orientalist in Germany, and a man of enormous learning.

Sayce, the Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, has a right to rank as an expert and scholar with Cheyne, the Oriel Professor of Scripture Interpretation. Margoliouth, the Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, as far as learning is concerned, is in the same rank with Driver, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, and the conclusion of this great scholar with regard to one of the widely vaunted theories of the radical school, is almost amusing in its terseness.

"Is there then nothing in the splitting theories," he says, in summarizing a long line of defense of the unity of the book of Isaiah; "is there then nothing in the splitting theories? To my mind, *nothing at all*" (*Lines of Defense*, p.136).

Green and Orr are as able, if not abler, scholars than Robertson Smith and Professor Briggs, and both of these men, as a result of the widest and deepest research, have come to the conclusion that the theories of the Germans are unscientific, unhistorical, and unscholarly. The last words of Professor Green in his very able work on the *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* are most suggestive.

Would it not be wiser for them to revise their own ill-judged alliance with the enemies of evangelical truth, and inquire whether Christ's view of the Old Testament may not, after all, be the true view?

Yes. That, after all, is the great and final question. We trust we are not ignorant. We feel sure we are not malignant. We desire to treat no man unfairly, or set down aught in malice.

But we desire to stand with Christ and His Church. If we have any prejudice, we would rather be prejudiced against rationalism. If we have any bias, it must be against a teaching which unsteadies heart and unsettles faith. Even at the expense of being thought behind the times, we prefer to stand with our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in receiving the Scriptures as the Word of God, without objection and without a doubt. A little learning, and a little listening to rationalistic theorists and sympathizers may incline us to uncertainty; but deeper study and deeper research will incline us as it inclined Hengstenberg and Möller, to the profoundest conviction of the authority and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures; and to cry, "Thy word is very pure; therefore; Thy servant loveth it."

Appendix

It may not be out of place to add here a small list of reading matter that will help the reader who wants to strengthen his position as a simple believer in the Bible. As I said before, a large list would be altogether too cumbersome. I would only put down those that I have personally found most valuable and suggestive. If one can afford only one or two, I would suggest Green and Kennedy; or Munhall and Parker; or Saphir and Anderson; or Orr and Urquhart.

The most massive and scholarly are Horne's Introduction, and Pusey on Daniel, but they are deep, heavy and suitable only for the more cultured and trained readers.

GREEN.

The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.—Scribner's.

GREEN.

General Introduction to the Old Testament, in 2 vols.; the Text and the Canon.—Scribner's.

GREEN.

Unity of Genesis.—Scribner's.

The foregoing are very good. Green was a great scholar, the Princeton Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature, a man who deeply loved the Bible and the Lord Jesus. He is perhaps the strongest of the scholarly opponents of the rationalistic Higher Critics.

ORR.

The Bible under Trial.—Armstrong & Son, New York.

ORR.

The Problem of the Old Testament.—Nesbit & Co. Dr. Orr is one of the ablest and most scholarly writers in the English-speaking world today.

BISSELL.

The Pentateuch. Its Origin and Structure.—Scribner's.

BISSELL.

Introduction to Genesis. Printed in colors.

Bissell is a careful scholar, and writes from the conservative side. Able, but not so firm as Green.

MUNHALL.

The Highest Critic vs. the Higher Critics.—Revell. By an evangelist, and therefore from the earnest rather than the expert standpoint. More to the level of the average reader than Green or Bissell.

MÖLLER.

Are the Critics Right?—Revell.

By a former follower of Graf-Wellhausen and most interesting to the scholarly. Hardly suitable for the average reader, as it assumes familiarity with the technicalities of the German critical school.

MARGOLIOUTH.

Lines of Defense of the Biblical Revelation.—Hodder & Stoughton.

Academic and technical; intensely interesting. His reasoning is not equally powerful throughout, however.

ANDERSON.

The Bible and Modern Criticism.—Revell.

The work of a layman, vigorous and earnest. He gives no uncertain sound.

PARKER.

None Like It. A plea for the old sword.—Revell. Vigorous and slashing, too, but grand in the eloquence of its pleadings. Every minister should read it. Brimming with sanctified common sense.

SAYCE.

The Early History of the Hebrews.—Rivington's. The chapter on the composition of the Pentateuch is very strong.

WALLER.

Moses and the Prophets.—Nisbet.

A vigorous and unanswerable criticism of Driver's treatment of the Pentateuch.

KENNEDY.

Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned.—Revell.

A small and cheap book, but well worth study.

SHERATON.

The Higher Criticism.—The Tract Society, Toronto.

A most valuable little work. Thoroughly up-to-date

The following works also, although they are not exactly along the line of the Higher Criticism, are most valuable and suggestive:

SAPHIR.

Christ and the Scriptures.—Revell.

A little book, but a multum in parvo. To my mind for its size the best thing ever written on the subject.

SAPHIR.

The Divine Unity of Scripture.—Revell.

A great book. Full of well cooked meat. Most scholarly, deeply spiritual, always suggestive.

PIERSON.

Many Infallible Proofs.—Revell.

Earnest, full, illustrative; most helpful.

URQUHART.

The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures.—Marshall Bros.

Excellent and scholarly.

GIBSON.

The Ages before Moses.—Oliphant's, Edinburgh.

A most valuable and suggestive work. Especially useful to young ministers.

GIBSON.

The Mosaic Era.—Randolph, New York.

Spiritual and suggestive also.

A scholarly friend suggests also the following:

Rev. Thos. Whitelaw, M.A., D.D., LL.D., on *The Old Testament Problem*.

James W. Thurtell, LL.D., D.D., on *Old Testament Problems*.

C. H. Rouse, M.A., LL.B., D.D., on *Old Testament Criticism in New Testament Light*.

Rev. Hugh McIntosh, M.A., on *Is Christ Infallible and The Bible True?*

Toronto, Canada

God and the Depression

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA

FAMINES, droughts, hurricanes, typhoons, accidents, disasters, and panics do not come about by chance. They must be reconciled with one's view of God and the world. If God is the sum total of the universe these are simply natural events and need no reconciliation. If God does not exist there is no need for reconciliation. But if God is the transcendent Creator and Sustainer of the universe Who is omnipotent and good, these events must be reconciled with His goodness. It is not our purpose to deal with the disasters of nature that so often take place, but to state a view concerning the present world depression which is Christian, and which is not descriptive but is explanatory. Anyone can tell us that a depression is here, but few are able to say why it is here. More cold thinking is being done by American economists, business men, and religious leaders because of the depression than has taken place for some time.

On the one hand we hear from our pulpits optimistic phrases of encouragement which tell us that God is in His heaven and all is right with the world, that we should gird up the loins of our minds and press forward to victory. But with these high sounding phrases we hear no definite reason for our present condition, and no concrete solution for the problem. On the other hand, we hear pessimistic denouncements of our present church regime and economic system, which are based upon prejudiced experiences or observations. A bland optimism will never meet the world problem which is before us. A destructive pessimism should be utterly shunned. The reason for these two extremes on the part of men who are in leadership is their hazy knowledge of the Bible and their misunderstanding of its great precepts.

God has given a definite body of teaching in His word in reference to periods of depression and of material indigence, both in regard to His own people and to the world. There is no subject of life upon which the Word has not spoken. While still a student in seminary, and before the forerunners of this present depression arrived, this teaching became clear through extended Bible study. At that time the writer predicted to a student congregation which he served that there was

soon to be a depression and a panic which would bring great blessing to both the church and the world. Two years later, when speaking in a large men's meeting along this line of truth, the writer ended his discourse with the prayer asking God to increase the stress of the present situation until men would accept the demonstration that the Lord was God. Some criticized this prayer, and yet it was justified in the face of the truth of the Bible, and in spite of the suffering that would be caused and has been caused by the coming of this depression. That Scriptural teaching is very clear.

In the History of Redemption there is a close parallel between the Old Testament periods of the church. These are quite startling. The Israelitish nation was founded by Abraham, who was thereafter known as the father of all believers. The New Testament Church was initiated by Christ after whom all of the New Testament believers are called. Following Abraham, twelve patriarchs headed the Israelitish nation and became the leaders of different tribes which descended from them. Christ chose twelve apostles to propagate His teachings, and who should win spiritual posterity.

Following the patriarchal period in Israel there was a season of persecution and of miracles, manifestly those which took place in Egypt, and there were some miracles that were connected with the patriarchs themselves. The New Testament church was immediately persecuted after its beginning and along with the persecution ran a notable series of miracles, giving authority to the new religion. Israel conquered its persecutors or the Egyptians through miracles and became mixed with worldly desires and faithlessness in the wilderness.

Likewise, the New Testament church conquered its persecutors, but became mixed with the worldly heathen practices around the Mediterranean. At the close of the wilderness period Israel entered Canaan land in power as a victorious people and religion. In 322 A.D. Christianity entered the Roman empire as the state religion in power and in dominion, causing many of the Romans to nominally become Christians. Israel disobeyed the command of God and failed to cast

out the Canaanites so that in time she was corrupted by them. Christianity failed to cast out the heathen practices of Roman worship and in turn was conquered by them through accepting them into the church. Israel was punished by God through being allowed to enter into the periods of bondage and of judges, during which time there were five major judges and many minor deliverers. The New Testament church was punished by God by being allowed to enter the Dark Ages, which was ended by a period of judges. Following the judges Israel took to itself the false king Saul whom they chose rather than the leadership of God's judges. The New Testament church is prophesied by Paul and by Jesus to be concluded by the appearance of the false king—Anti-Christ. Israel then received the true king—David, who delivered her from all her enemies. The Anti-Christ shall be followed by the coming of David's son who is Christ the Lord, who shall deliver the church from all of her enemies. The first David ended his line in failure, but the second David shall be crowned with the fullness of success as the Son of Man and the everlasting King of Kings. The parallel is complete.

We are in the period of the judges today. This period might be described either with the cycles of history or with the economic business charts which describe the high and the lows of business today. Let us think of it in the terms of cycles. When Israel entered Canaan it entered upon a period of prosperity as an independent self-governing group of people. It was not long, however, till this prosperity caused them to become lax in their relationship to God. As a result the Canaanitish influences contaminated them, and they fell into sinful practices. In punishment for their sin God permitted them to be conquered by their enemies, who in turn confiscated their weapons and the products of their fields. This always ended in a period of indigence and depression. After the people had endured these depressions for a certain length of time they grew desperate and realized that the reason for their condition was the departure from the worship and service of Jehovah. Again they called upon God and returned unto Him in repentance and faith. They cried for a deliverer. God heard that cry and sent unto them a great deliverer who defeated their enemies and brought back the times of prosperity and of independence. Prosperity then

again caused sin, and sin bondage, and bondage repentance, and repentance a deliverer, and so the cycles went on through thirteen or fifteen revolutions, and were ended by the time of the false king. The last cycle went deeper than all the rest. We read that the priesthood was corrupted so that God could not find a man to stand before Him, that adultery was practiced by the priests in the temple, that economic oppression existed without, and the enemies of Israel overran the land. When the cycle reached this depth the false king came.

Today the cycles are still progressing. The church enters a period of prosperity, and being unable to stand its exaltation it falls into sin and lowers its standards and its message until the moral conditions in the world are extremely deplorable. God then allows it to enter a period of bondage to its enemies, either in the form of the state or of intellectual unbelief, which period has been always followed by a material depression and great indigence. Empty stomachs then startle men into thinking about God once more until they call for spiritual deliverers, who come in the form of great preachers heading revivalistic movements. Across the pages of the history of the church move men like Zwingli, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Finney, Moody, and a host of lesser lights, who led less impressive movements. They were judges of God sent in answer to the cry of those in bondage. That we are in such a state of bondage today cannot be controverted. That we are in the drag period of a depression is evident on all sides.

The manifestations of sin that have entered into business and are partially causing our condition are quite well known, and yet are very surprising. They are so common that we have come to think nothing about them in this period of the breakdown of morals. When there was no judge in Israel every man did what was right in his own eyes. So it is today. Political and national life have become so corrupt that the average person is crying out against oppressive taxes and unjust assessments laid upon him to meet the big "steals" in governmental life. We find the officials of the greatest cities of our country inextricably connected with graft and racketeering which bring public indictment upon them continually. Underlying the business of our country is a network of racketeering and protection that is carried on by organized vice and gangsters. And within

business itself I am told by numbers of good Christian men that they find themselves in an increasingly hostile environment if they will not indulge in unmoral and anti-Christian practices. We are told that this age shall end with a period in which all will be forced to wear the mark of the beast. Is this mark of the beast the compulsory conformity to the unethical economic systems of the day? We are in the drag period, both of sin and its resulting depression.

In the face of conditions like this God in His mercy and His providence has permitted another period of material indigence to sweep across the world. People are finding themselves willing to work but unable to find work. That which they have is being taken away from them, and they are distracted as they waver between conflicting opinions and attempted solutions. Multitudes of formerly successful and able men who had grown self-sufficient are completely helpless and impotent. There is nothing that they can do but sit by and watch the structure that they have spent years to rear crumble about them in ruins. They see the rich controlling more, the poor losing all, and the middleman being crushed with the burden of the support of the nation. As a result many are denouncing capitalism as a failure, and are looking toward communism with a new interest. Others are laying the blame at the door of democracy and are looking with longing eyes toward a trained autocracy or a dictatorship. Confusion exists on every hand, fear and panic grip the hearts.

This panic is permitted by God with the purpose of startling men into thinking about God and God's claims. It was in those terrible periods of confusion that the great characters were formed who led Israel out of distress. And one must not forget that the great judges of modern Israel have been men who were born amid such confusion and often reared in hard times, and simultaneously the masses are brought to the place where they will accept the authority of such a leader again, for they realize the utter failure of attempting to live without a criterion of life.

In the midst of these periods of depression and panic it is inescapable that the good will suffer with the evil. When a cosmic movement is permitted of God it sweeps before it both the righteous and the wicked. Just as in His common grace God sends the sun upon the good and the evil and the rain

upon the just and the unjust, so in His judgments He does the same. Many Christian people find themselves today in situations that are hard to endure. Their temptation is to become embittered and hardened toward God. To them I believe there is a definite message necessary today.

First it is that they have a right to expect God to interfere in environment for them, that something will come along to keep them from abject poverty. They cannot demand this from God, but I feel from the general trend of Scripture that they have a right to expect it in answer to their believing prayers. They should also expect the church of which they have been members to help them as far as is possible within the limits of its ability.

Secondly, these people must realize that Christianity is true regardless of their condition in life. The early Christians were persecuted and were stripped of all their property and possessions. This has happened again and again through history. Yet the true Christian loves God for God's sake, regardless of his own condition in life. Without such a faith he is simply serving God for what God would give him, and this is an unworthy motive.

I stated above that depression came in the drag period of cycles of church history, and that these depressions were preceded by sin and followed by revivals. The Book of the Judges of Israel may be charted as a modern business chart, and we will find first prosperity, then the decline through sin, and then depression, then the upward line through prayer and spiritual revival, then the height of prosperity, followed again by the decline through sin. This chart will vary as to the length of the periods of prosperity, the intensity of the sin, and the duration of the bondage.

Likewise, a chart may be drawn scientifically of the history of the revivals in the church periods. Before the Great Reformation under Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, the peasants of Europe were mere chattel. They belonged to the land, and their condition was terrible. There was a rise of wealthy merchants, but most of the people were in abject condition. This partially accounts for the great Peasant's War, the responsibility of which is laid at Luther's door because of his preaching of the Gospel.

Before the Wesleyan revival, England was passing through the industrial revolution.

Gin and distilled liquor was introduced in 1720, and now with the long hours of labor, the poverty of the people, and the drunkenness caused by gin drinking, the people had deteriorated into a half-brutalized savagery, and more than one historian believes that if it had not been for the Wesleyan revival, England would have passed through a far worse experience than the French Revolution with its guillotine and reign of terror.

This great revival even carried over into America in what is known as the Great Awakening of 1741 and 1742 through Gilbert Tennant and Jonathan Edwards, and a little later through Francis Asbury and Peter Cartwright. In 1850, America was about to pass through its industrial revolution, and in the early fifties a tremendous panic gripped the country, which was followed by the preaching of Charles Finney and the great camp meeting and evangelistic movement through which the church was again purged, and the common people brought to God.

We are in a like period today, and the question presents itself as to how it shall be met. Will the church see its duty and return to real faith in the Bible and the things of God, and to its knees in confident intercessory prayer, which will result in the raising up of a deliverer or a great group of deliverers who will call men back to God? Or will the church fail and through its failure bring about the hardening of the hearts of men, and an increase in their rejection of the truth so that they will turn to atheism and anti-theism such as exist in Russia as a national policy, which period will probably be ended by the appearance of the Anti-Christ in the world.

We are given the signs of the times in the Scripture which shall mark the beginning of the end, and many of those signs seem to be before us at the present. I do not imply that these signs are more fulfilled today than they were before, for when the cycles take place they are partially fulfilled each time. But some day we shall reach the bottom of the last cycle, and when we do the world will be ripe for the judgment and Christ will come. It may be that we are now reaching the bottom of the greatest cycle, and it may be that we are on the eve of a tremendous revival, either of which may conceivably take place. The end of the age may not take place for a long period of time as yet, and then again it may take place at any moment.

What happens will largely depend upon us as Christians, upon our prayers, our faith, and our attitude toward men. We may thank God for this depression and for this panic, and we may legitimately pray that He will increase the stress of it until men are prodded into thinking their way through upon God and life again. In the meantime, it is also our duty to bear the burden of the stress by personally helping worthy people, whether among our friends or our relatives, and as a church to serve the needs of our members, and as members of society to ameliorate the terrible conditions of suffering among men. Then whether through the preaching of the Word, a revival comes, or whether we have reached the end of the age will make little difference to us, for we are walking in the Will of God. We are not doing what is right in our eyes, but we have the eternal program and standard of God fulfilled.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

A Day of Prayer

CATHERINE E. VANDYCK

MAY we not have a national proclamation for a day of prayer, looking to God for wisdom and guidance, and for confession of sin?

Every loyal American citizen knows that our land (these United States) has been blessed of God, and honored as no other nation has. Some of these nations are now looking to us for help in this time of worldwide fear and perplexity. Yet, *as a nation* we are not looking to God in confession of the sins of which we are guilty; the awful desecration of God's Holy Day, the lawlessness and blasphemy and rebellion against God. Our honored President is endeavoring with all his strength, and great ability, to solve these preplexing world problems; but many are beginning to realize that no wisdom of *man* can meet and dispel the distress and troubles of our own land, and of the nations of the earth. Our only hope, as a nation, is in *openly* acknowledging God in confession of sin, and by looking to Him for His wisdom and guidance, and in praising Him for the answer. If this is done, we may be sure of great national blessing, for God never fails to answer such a plea when made in the name of Christ.

The national history of Israel, running

all through the Old Testament, is given us for a warning, and is a perfect picture of the nations of today. Israel's many, unspeakable, and continued sins, and rebellion against God, would seem to us, to have shut them out from any help from God in their distress; but we read again, and again, that the faintest cry to God in confession of sin, and for help was always quickly answered, and deliverance and help given. God changeth not. He is the same "Yesterday, today, and forever."

Below are a few of the many of God's warnings and promises of forgiveness and help, which are as true and as sure as they were in Israel's day.

Jer.22:29. O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord.

Psa.78:37,38. For their heart was not right with

Him, neither were they steadfast in His covenant. But He being full of compassion forgave their iniquity and destroyed them not. Yea, many a time turned He His anger away and did not stir up all his wrath.

Dan.9:13. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us. Yet, made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.

Isa.30:15,16,18. For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength; and ye would not . . . and therefore will the Lord wait that He may be gracious unto you, and therefore will He be exalted that He may have mercy upon you; for the Lord is a God of judgment; blessed are all they that wait for Him.

2 Chron.7:14. If my people which are called by my name shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear them from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their band.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Story of Mother's Restored Sight

DR. EDWARD D. MALLORY

IN 1880 I was associated with Rev. Hugh Johnston in Great Saint James Street Methodist Church, Montreal, Canada. Upon Dr. Johnston's return home from attending a convention for the deepening of the Spiritual life, held at Old Orchard, Maine, by Dr. Charles Cullis of Boston, Mass., he told me, among other things, of the remarkable answers to prayer on the part of Dr. Cullis for the healing of the sick. As my own precious mother had been losing her sight for seven years and was practically blind, being able to discern only day light from dark, I was profoundly interested in this story of healings, and at once arranged to go and see Dr. Cullis and ask him to pray for my mother's sight to be restored.

When I met him and told him of mother's condition I anxiously enquired if he thought there was any hope for her. Looking at me seriously he enquired, "Is she a Christian or is she a Methodist?"

For a moment I was shocked, but then discerning the twinkle in his eyes I replied, "She is a Christian."

"One case is the same as another to the Lord," he replied. We bowed in prayer and he asked, "Lord if it please Thee, lay Thy hand of healing upon this young man's mother and restore her sight for Christ's sake. Amen." Rising from our knees he said, "Count it done." I was surprised at the

shortness of his prayer but afterwards learned that this was characteristic of the Doctor.

I returned to Montreal and the next day went to my country home at Mallorytown, Ontario, and told mother of my visiting Dr. Cullis and of his prayer for her sight to be restored. She immediately asked me what day and hour the Doctor prayed for her. I wondered why she asked me such a question but was able to tell her the very day and hour. She then remarked that the reason she asked that question was that at that very day and hour she was made conscious of the presence of God in such a manner that she went alone, almost overwhelmed with awe and delight such as she had never known before. But in regard to the matter of healing, she told me she was perfectly willing to be blind the rest of her days, for the Lord gave and the Lord had taken away, and she had only praise in her heart for all her mercies, and desired nothing but the glory of His great name.

I said to her, "But, mother, if you could glorify God more by having your sight restored than by being blind, would you not be willing?"

"Yes," she replied. "I wish to live only for His glory. If I could glorify God more by being blind than by having back my sight, I am willing to be blind. But if He sees I could honor Him more with my sight than without it, of course I desire it."

Then we had prayer together and I returned to Montreal. This was in September, 1880.

Returning home for Christmas, Mother met me at the door and kissed me. Then holding me off at arm's length she said with a heavenly smile, "My boy I can see you perfectly now, and I can see to thread a needle with my glasses, and I read my Bible every day"—something she had not been able to do for years before. She then told me that after we had prayer together in September, for two weeks her eyes troubled her more than usual, but it did not disturb her peace of mind in the least for she had left all in God's hands for Him to

do as He saw fit. After two weeks her sight slowly began to improve till she could see clearly. But she said the sweet consciousness of God's presence with her continually was more to her than her sight which she enjoyed till her translation in January, 1906.

How I thank God for such a saintly mother and for her most remarkable answers to prayer. Her last words were, "My children, after I have gone I do not want any one of you ever to speak or think of mother as dead or buried, for I will be living and reigning with Christ, so whenever you think of mother, think of her in the glory land."

Boston

Missing the Christianity of Christ

C. H. BUCHANAN, D.D.

CHRISTIANITY is a vast and beautiful system of religion; and when its truth is known and rightly followed it brings to its possessor the richest blessings and sweetest comforts known to mortals. As truth it satisfies the mind and sustains the soul. This explains why men in all ages of its history have given their all to its embrace and have died rather than deny its Founder. It is of wonderful expansion, and may be approached in so many ways that none of any age or nation need to be without its blessed presence in the soul.

But, strange to say, so many will not faithfully follow its principles, but will so yield to their own impulses, that they miss the real Christianity of Christ. This, Dr. Paul Carus, in *Primer of Philosophy*, means when he says:

Remember there are two Christianities. One which men have built up in their theories about Christ; the other is the teachings of Christ himself.

Professor Wiggam, in his *New Decalogue of Science*, has the same thought. He says:

When I refer to "Christianity," I do not mean the religion of Christ. If this could but lay hold of the souls of men it would bring in the millennium.

Evidently both of these scientists whose aim was to express truth, have seen that many have missed the real Christianity and were putting forth a spurious something called by that illustrious name. This men do in many ways. Sometimes with honesty of heart but lack of real personal knowledge of what real

religion is. At other times men seem to be malicious in their perversion of the religion of Christ. And these perversions give occasion to skeptics to hurl their fiery shafts of criticisms at Christianity, as if the spurious something they see were the real *bona fide* Christianity. What we Christians should lose no pains to show, is that such men only miss the Christianity of Christ.

The Saviour did not fail to caution His disciples that, "False Christs and false prophets shall arise . . . and if possible, deceive the very elect." Now, we wish to say that this "deceiving" may be done in perfect sincerity of soul. Men first deceive themselves, then as "blind leaders of the blind," they deceive others, thinking they are in the line of the truth. This they do in not taking a broad conception of the teachings of Christ himself.

The Uniqueness of Christ

Not having gone to the depths of the teachings of Christ so as to appreciate the uniqueness of his truths, men want to see in the teachings of pagan writers the same things which Christ taught, thus robbing Him of His high position of being the founder of His religion. Men do this when they deny the vital principles of Christ's religion. Men before Him have taught a high morality and thus have established worthy laws for society; but no other teacher had ever made those moral laws to hark back to the indwelling spirit of a Father God, and led men to be true and kind to each other

because they were the children of one common spiritual Father?

How can the Modernist who does not admit of a personal living ruling God, and sees only a "resident force" in nature, surging all around us, and by inexorable laws governing the world of mankind, ever possibly appreciate the brotherhood of man, and seek that to be established with the soul-yearning of some? They miss this world-principle in Christianity and are dead to its vitalizing influence, because they will not admit of the Father God of Christ. That such men fail of appreciating the finer features of the Christianity of Christ at this point, is a logical matter of course. It could not well be otherwise. Men cannot have lights in their lamps with no oil in their vessels. When men know the fatherhood of God in their own hearts, they rejoice that others may know it also.

Religion is humanity's natural endowment, and expresses itself in an instinct to worship. This worship may take form in an effort to appease an offended deity or to seek protection from some imminent danger, such as storms and pestilence. Thus God took form in the minds of men as the great Ruler and giver of inexorable laws. God was thought of as God of power, wrath, and vengeance,—a Being to be propitiated.

But it remained for Christ to reveal to the world the Father-God of love and mercy, a God who loved the world and gave His only Son to die for men that they might have everlasting life. Christ founded his religion upon the greatest, oldest and most enduring of all human passion,—the passion of love as it flows fresh from the heart of the heavenly Father and finds response in the souls of men. While pagans see power manifesting itself in nature,—one man said: "I have swept the heavens with my telescope for years, but have not found God,"—Christians see a manifestation of Himself in the sunshine and in the beauty of nature. Carl Linne, Sweden's famous botanist, saw a lily opening, and stood with lifted hat, and came away to say: "I stood and saw God pass by." Such see God in nature because He is in their hearts. Not being in the heart He cannot be seen elsewhere.

Men miss the thrill of real Christianity because they will not commit themselves wholly to it, and find its fullness by living it. In every line of effort, "no man can serve

two masters." To know science one must lose himself in it. If one will not enlist to the full in the religion of Christ, how can he find his *new self*, with its thrill and joy? Of course to such a man Christianity seems a failure. He will not leap upon its promises, nor bask in its sunshine, nor let God have sway with his life. He will not treat God as he treats any reputable physician in sickness, will not submit himself to His treatment and by faith take his medicine. How know the ocean's power to bear up great ships unless they be launched out upon its bosom? How can one know the pain-relieving power of an anesthesia unless its balmy fumes be inhaled? How can one know the power of Christianity, the rapture of her love and the transcendence of her life, if the life is not entered upon and lived? How can men know the sustaining power of God's grace as the martyrs and our mothers knew it, if men hold back and will not commit their all into His hands? They will not give God a chance to be gracious to them, and give them soul-enrichment.

Yet, these are the ones who talk the loudest against Christianity, denouncing it as being a deception and a snare. Those who live Christianity and have put it to the test, scientist like, are clearest in the testimony of its reality. A knowing witness stands above rebuttal; an unknowing testimony is worthless in any court. Those souls are right in reaching the conclusion that, fellowship with Christ is the simplest and surest way of knowing the reality of his religion. Souls who give themselves to religious effort find richest, fullest life, and say: "*Oh, I have just begun to live!*"

Thus it is that many an honest hearted citizen, without a word of Latin or Greek, by the commitment of himself entirely to Christ, may now be seen to go up and down the country, turning hundreds of thousands of sinners away from a wrong life to become noble Christian citizens. But here sit the balking objectors of Christianity with the Ph.D. degrees, swinging their spectacles denouncing Christianity.

Defeated by Self-Exaltation

Beyond a doubt, scholarship's greatest stumbling block to becoming Christian, lies in the requirement of self-surrender to Christ. Much of scholarship is, deep down, intensely selfish and ambitious.

If there be "that last infirmity of a noble mind," with some scholars it seems to be the desire for recognition, to be known at his imagined value, to be read of and talked about by the world. We all show a weakness at this point. To sink out of sight and to be known as "a servant of the Lord Jesus," is asking too much of a modernist with a high degree. Other men will not sink wealth into the kingdom of heaven, neither will the university graduate. Yet, it is just here that men by losing their life come to find it, ennobled and enriched, as they come to live not for selfish attainment, but for the uplift of others.

Men could track Julius Caesar across Gaul by the smoke of burning villages and fields laid waste. Of course he became famous,—and fell under the daggers of an endangered nation. Men could track David Livingstone across darkest Africa by the waste places which became as gardens of Eden to an enlightened people whom he found savages and left them trustful Christians. His attending servants needed no murder's dagger; they would have died for the Doctor, whom they followed because of the love between them.

If men could but follow in the footsteps of Jesus in the giving of themselves to and for lost men, they would soon come to the noon-tide of Christian knowledge and spiritual attainment. Missionaries in the darkest heathenism are the staunchest advocates for the reality of the religion of Christ. They see it at work, know its evident value, and feel its warming impulse swaying their every faculty. Everywhere when the leadership of Christ is followed men come to have the martyr's love and heroic fidelity to their Lord. When self is entirely given over to the Lord, then men come to find the open port and sesame to all that life has in store. This was true in the life of John Wanamaker. Late in life in the sacredness of the home circle, friends asked the secret of his life. His answer was: "Early in life I committed my self and my business to the keeping of my Lord, and have followed him ever since." That was enough. The world knows the rest. The nation over, there are multitudes of such "inglorious Miltons" who, men and women alike, have lived for their Lord and humanity, and have enjoyed the love of mankind and the fellowship of God to the full. They believe in Christianity because they have found its secret in living for others rather than for self. This is the Christ

religion in its simplicity, full of peace and power.

Neglecting Divine Aid

In reality, the greatest hindrance to knowing the Christianity of Christ is found in an egotistic reliance upon self alone, and not seeking divine aid in the struggles of life. Christ felt this wave when he said: "Men will not come unto me that they may have life." Self-sufficiency is the bane of too many well-to-do. They feel no need of a Redeemer, and they know none. Hence they will not pray. But how can Christianity be known without prayer? It was born of humanity's cry for soul help. Its continuation in the world today is the result of the fervent prayer of faithful saints.

There are those who think it unscientific to pray, that to do so is to attempt a reversal of the laws of the universe. With some men a prayerless life is the result of this false philosophy. When men conclude that all the laws of life are fixed and must work themselves out, they seem not to be able to bring themselves to pray, since to do so would imply that the human desire is stronger than the will of God. Mr. G. J. Romanes tells us himself, that during his skeptical days he could not bring himself to the simplest act of worship, that "for the space of a quarter of a century the act of prayer had not been performed by me." The reason was plain; a fatalism possessed him. He could not bring himself to "will the attempt," since it seemed to array his will against the will of fate.

Akin to this is the "mechanical philosophy of prayer" which holds that the chief result of praying is a subjective one, reacts upon the praying man himself. The scientific explanation of this is, praying only arouses "the thyroid and adrenal glands" which pour their secretions into the liver, and this in turn pours its secretions into the heart and arouses it and enables the worshipper to come from his prayer-meeting feeling refreshed and better,—just as "a good cry often helps a woman." This they contend, is man's part in having the self ready to receive the Divine benefit, as God always reveals Himself to the extent of man's readiness to receive.

Now, it can readily be seen that this "mechanical philosophy of religion" is only a superstition, utterly without foundation in fact. One who espouses it must of necessity miss the meaning of the Christianity of

Christ. As a proof of its futility, the philosophers who pretend to believe in it, confess that in the hour of extreme need, they reverse their policy and cry for help to the Heavenly Father who is touched with a feeling of our infirmities.

The advocates of such a philosophy are not in an attitude to know, much less to judge of real Christianity, since they know not to hold sweet communion with the Father of Spirits. How futile then, to expect of such persons a correct conception of religion, or to be able to tell the world what the Christianity of Christ really is. As well expect a Napoleon, schooled to the thunder-tone of belching cannon, to interpret classic symphonies, or a Burbank to teach us astronomy. The scientist who scorns prayer should listen to Tennyson's words of wisdom when he says that, "More things are wrought by prayer than the world dreams of,"—but not by a mechanical philosophy of prayer.

Ignoring the Paraclete

That men will not pray nor enlist themselves in the kingdom of heaven, is not the whole of their delinquencies which defeat their knowing the realities of Christ's religion. By their not complying with the essential conditions on their side of religion, they miss the great secret of success to be had from the divine side. By denying the existence and office of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, promised by the Lord himself, how can men possibly come to the real religion of Christ? If men deny the existence of a living, ruling personal God, and hide behind the material "smoke screen" of a "residential force in nature," as appears in gravitation, electricity and surging life, how can they ever know that "force within us, not our selves, which makes for righteousness"?

Christianity was born of the Holy Spirit,—the manifest energizing of God in the world looking to the redemption of man. The Church with all her imperfections, is a storm-center for righteousness, as it is energized by the Holy Spirit. Only as it is thus empowered and guided can the Church serve her purpose. The absence of His power in the individual life, as well as in the Church has always been a source of calamity.

Our greatest men are of the opinion that the waywardness of the young life of today, heading towards suicide, is largely due to loss in society of the conscious presence of the Spirit of God. Denying this, men have

no uplifting ideals, no deep plans in life, are without the consolations of the Spirit in deep sorrow and have no sustaining power in distress. What wonder their children want to resort to self-destruction! A science without the Holy Spirit must of necessity be pessimistic, cold and hopeless. A church without it is no better. This is a sad statement, but history confirms its truthfulness. The Eastern Church, since its denial of the Holy Spirit, eleven centuries ago, has been a lifeless something. She has been without the blessings of the Reformation, has never had a great revival and has no historical heroes and martyrs. While claiming orthodoxy, she has been only an "orthodox fossil."

If the Churches of the Reformation have not all been faithful to the leadings of the Holy Spirit, and some may have languished by the way, yet in these Churches the Holy Spirit has ever been cherished. Especially is this true of the churches of the Puritan type. By the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have kept evangelism alive in the world, and to them belongs the honor of pushing the kingdom of Christ to earth's remotest bounds. They have manifested the fruits of experimental religion in the world.

In those countries where perverted Christianity has long been in existence revolutions have occurred with their destructive results. Wherever the schemes of men take the place of the will of God and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, one may expect degenerate Christianity. Church members who have been born of the will of men, and not of the Holy Spirit, are in fact spiritual bastards and have not the soul-vitality to repeople the Church with genuine children of God.

Men who, like James Chalmers, have committed themselves entirely into the keeping of the Spirit, have learned the way of Christian success. In the early years of his ministry Chalmers drew such pictures of sins of which not one of his listeners was guilty, that they sat with amazement, wondering what it all meant. But during a spell of sickness he consecrated himself to the Holy Spirit. On his return to the pulpit, he preached with such holy love and magnetism that hungry souls filled his church to overflowing, and often rose to their feet under the spell of his oratory. This Chalmers held to be "the beginning of his spiritual life."

The same triumph was true of D. L. Moody, a modest layman in Chicago. He re-

solved there should be at least "one man completely under the power of the Holy Spirit." Soon his light began to glow in his local atmosphere. Then men began to seek his help, and doors opened for his phenomenal revivals, both here and in the British Isles. To know the secret of his success one had but to hear or to read his lecture on "The Secret of Power."

Now, let us have the conclusion of the whole matter: He who will not admit of the divinity of our Lord, will not enlist himself with him, will not pray, and will not believe in the existence of the Holy Spirit and be led by Him, deprives himself of being "in tune with the Infinite," and loses the "Power of an endless life." Thus he misses that

which alone makes humanity greater than itself. The obedient soul by his own decree is given by Christ the right to know the gift of God, eternal life. But men by their unwillingness miss the chance of all life and of necessity must grope through life. By not reaching up, trolley like, after the power-line, men miss connection with the great Dynamo of eternal life, and fail to bring God into inter-communication with the human. Thus by unbelief they block God's opportunity with man, and fit themselves for eternal failures.

Can such ones by any imagination be supposed rightful exponents of the Christianity of Christ?

Richmond, Kentucky

Moses and the Pentateuch

E. VAN DEUSEN

IF the final composition of the Pentateuch was not made until a period immediately antedating and following the Babylonian Exile one of the greatest problems before the Graf-Wellhausen higher critic is to find the man Moses. Moses and the Pentateuch go together. If the dates of the Pentateuch are to be changed then the dates of Moses must be changed, or else a man equally great must be found to explain the literary, legislative and linguistic excellence of the first five books of the Old Testament.

It is just as meaningless to attribute the work of the Pentateuch to one or more unknown redactors as to attribute the work of Paul or Chaucer or Shakespeare to a group of unknown compilers. Great works always presuppose men greatly used of God.

Any great or excellent body of literature is the genius of a man; whether it be history, such as Herodotus, or Gibbons; essay, as Montaigne, or Bacon; philosophy, as Aristotle, or Kant; (who could possibly imagine the philosophy of Aristotle the compilation of a group of his followers?) dramas, such as Aeschylus, or Shakespeare where each body of writings has the stamp of a single great dramatic mind. Could any group of men put Browning together? Could editors go over some scattered writings and produce the poems of John Keats? Can any group of obscure historians take the events of our national life and make them immortal literature?

Are not all periods of great literature or legislation marked by the actual, historic presence of great men? Has not all great legislation been made in the presence of great legislators—Hammurabi, Pericles, Solon, Charlemagne, etc.? If the supremely great language and law contained in the Pentateuch were produced by a number of obscure authors and compilers it is the first and only outstanding instance in either law or literature that such a thing has been done.

The relatively obscure Hilkiyah cannot be made a Moses. It would be the most fatuous kind of unscientific treatment to make Hilkiyah anything like the great man Moses, because there is absolutely nothing in the records to support such a position. The record makes Moses consummately equipped with all the adequate greatness of education, experience and endowment necessary for such a task. If Hilkiyah was such a man where is the evidence?

Furthermore, great literature and law never comes at the end of a nation's life. It is not an afterglow. It is rather the prophetic contribution of one or more known great men during the rise of a nation's greatness. In fact it is very reasonable to believe that such a contribution as the Pentateuch, composing such law, social science and divine revelation was the basis upon which Israel's rise to greatness was made possible.

Nations do not rise out of nothing. They rise as a result of the plantings of great

law or thought or personal courage that becomes the direction and goal of the nation's striving. The Israelites may not have been as cultured as many have thought down through the years, but it is entirely possible for Moses to have been all that the record says he was, and for him to have produced the writings attributed to him. Nations do not always explain great men, but great men do explain and characterize great nations. A nation's greatness under God is built around the lives and teachings of its great men.

It is true that in Classic Greek literature some tell us that Homer is a compilation of the writings of a group of early Greeks, but none of these higher literary critics has been able to get the leading authorities of Greek literature to believe in anything that seeks to destroy the person and authorship of Homer in any such fashion as the "J.E.D.P." theory of Wellhausen seeks to dispose of the work and place of Moses in the authorship of the Pentateuch.

The Wellhausen critic makes it necessary for the traditional Bible student to show that there was a language and a culture among the Israelite slave people far enough advanced when they came out of Egypt to have made the historic claims of the Pentateuch possible.

The twelve brethren were in Egypt with no language of their own, and with no national culture except the promises of Jehovah to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. They remained in captivity four hundred and thirty years. Were they at the end of that time a disorderly mass of primitive Bedouins beginning a national life, or had they a developed language and culture that would have supported the well ordered national life presented in the Pentateuch?

Many great scholars have shown such to be the case.

The negroes in this country might cast some light on what might have been possible. No one can say that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and his brethren were in so primitive a state as the African negro slaves who were brought to America a hundred years ago. And yet in a hundred years they have developed a racial life in their literature, spirituals and culture that might make them capable, under the right leadership of a strong national existence.

It might be well for us to get a summary of the Wellhausen position in order that the

argument may be clearer. Dr. DuBose gives such a summary, he says:

The forbears of the Hebrew race a generation or two before Abraham, (according to Wellhausen) had come, as a nomadic Bedouin group, out of northern Arabia. Abraham—if indeed there were a historic Abraham—dwelt in Palestine as a letterless sheik amongst an uncultured and fetish-worshipping people. There was at this time, little or no thought communication between Palestine and the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. Later, in Egypt, the descendants of Abraham preserved their Bedouin characteristics, the civilization of Egypt itself being provincial and possessing but few elements of culture and uplift.

With scantiest possible recognition of the traditional story, Wellhausen brings Moses and his tribal kinsmen to the escarpment of Mount Sinai. These tribal kinsmen of Moses are without even the rudiments of their future monotheistic faith—offspring of a desert ancestry, who, finding themselves in the desert, quickly revert to ancestral type and habits. Here Moses sows in their life the seeds of monotheism; he could scarcely do more than deposit the seeds, for the world that lay about him was desert, insensate, barbarous and devoid of the conditions of civilization and religion.

Beyond a spoken torah, consisting of a handful of precepts and statutes, Moses gave no laws to the tribes. The working out and engrossing of a legislation are not to be thought of as possible. It is all but asserted that both the means and the skill of writing were non-existent. The Levitical priesthood, the Tabernacle, and the Ark were historical, afterthoughts, while the written law was the finality and not the beginning of Hebrew nationality.

With the primordial of "Jehovah for Israel, and Israel for Jehovah," the tribes, after a struggle, entered Canaan to settle alongside those people of the land who were left unconquered, and in a large way to adopt their religious and ethical ideals to assist in the evolution of their own. The result was a fitful ebb and flow of national life, with a distinctly monotheistic faith templated in the inane of their future consciousness. In the meantime, traditional oral torahs, legends, and folk heroics constituted the national claim to a literature.

Upon this inertia, or halting development, broke the prophets with their burdens of judgment warning and promise. Monotheism then began to take, for the first time, a definite form, a *per saltum* of the long-drawn "development." This was the "ethical religion," which preceded the legal codes. The prophets of the Northern Kingdom of Israel were the pioneers in national literature. To one of their school, about 750 B.C., the beginnings of national history are to be traced. Under self-announced prophetic authority, rudimentary law codes began to be reduced to writing.

But now the political end of the nation approached. In almost the hour of national dissolution, an enterprising ecclesiastic, Hilkiah, with the aid of confederates, fabricated a body of laws—the most considerable draft hitherto attempted—and delivered it to Josiah, the last Israelitish king worthy to bear that title, as a book of laws spoken by the hand of Moses! The long night of inanition had passed, and now Israel was able to write, though under a pretense which, if made to stand in proof,

can only discredit every page of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In the Babylonian bondage Israel came into direct contact with the life, laws, and religion of that land. According to Wellhausen's theory, it was Israel's first opportunity to know the world thoughts and world faith represented in Babylonian literature. As a result, the tribes returned from their exile with an extensive law code, fabricated in the house of bondage, and again attributed to Moses, "the man of God." They also brought back a cosmology and a race history in which, as in an "envelope," was later inclosed the alleged Mosaic legislation. This was the real origin of the Pentateuch, and in no small measure of other parts of the Hebrew Canon.

One wonders if there is a single fact upon which such a critical hypothesis can be based. Even the monistic evolutionist that Wellhausen is trying so hard to follow pictures such a primitive tribal life very much earlier than the dates of Egypt and Babylonia. Furthermore we have archaeological evidences that prove beyond argument the existence of a well advanced culture in Egypt and Babylon during the years of Israel's Egyptian enslavement.

Aside from the divisive critic's own conflicting conjectures about them, there is no evidence that the assumed "P," "E," "J," etc., ever existed or were woven together to form the present Old Testament text.

This patchwork hypothesis is inadequate to validly explain the facts and the problems it creates, but constantly requires further hypotheses to support it: all statements, ideas or phrases of style in the text that do not

agree with the critical hypothesis are charged to some kind of interference by or omission of a "redactor"; or, if needed, a new one is assumed, to meet the situation. The introduction of these convenient helpers to the partition hypothesis expands its original "P" to "P¹", "P²", "P³", etc.; "E" becomes "E¹", "E²", "E³", etc.; "J" followed by "J¹", "J²", "J³", etc., similarly with all other "sources," redactors, etc., until the composition of God's Word suggests an "indeterminate equation" in mathematics, and you have— $O. T. = P + P^1 + 2 + 3 + JE + D + 1 + 2 + 3 + H^1 + 2 + 3 + R + RJ + R_p + Rh$, etc. to infinity. This inevitable need and outworking of the hypothesis shows its futility.

But where do we have an instance of a great body of law and literature being produced in such a fashion? Moses is the key to the problem of the Pentateuch. He may explain the Pentateuch even though the cultural condition of the Israelites at their coming out of Egypt may not entirely do so. Moses under claimed and proved divine guidance led the people. The people did not produce either the Pentateuch or Moses. God found Moses, and greatly used him. To him God spoke. So that the great body of history, law and social science is the product of Moses, a man of genius himself, led of God, building up the policies upon which Israel rose to national culture and greatness.

Syracuse, New York

Jesus and the Individual

JOHN J. BLYTHE, M.A., B.D.

IN the world's program, and sometimes in the church's, the individual receives scant notice. In the Kingdom idea and in the program of Jesus the individual is of infinite worth. The Kingdom begins with the individual. Jesus in his method was indifferent to the multitude, but cultivated the individual soul; he escaped from the multitude, but devoted himself to the single enquirer. By Him the individual was saved from absorption and from the sense of loss through his own insignificance.

Jesus began by emphasizing the worth of the individual soul; He never affected disdain toward the man who wanted to "save his own soul." Whenever He speaks of the soul of man it is with the sense of its intrinsic

worth which places all other things on the side of insignificance. "What shall it profit a man, etc?" "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

Jesus was the physician of the soul specifically. When one with physical ills was brought to Him for healing He said to him: "Thy sins be forgiven thee," thus directing his attention to the greatest need and the greatest gift.

It is this emphasis which dignifies the individual. The chemist's valuation may instruct and amuse us. The economist's frequently offends us. To him the human machine produces so much and lasts so long and then is scrapped—a man is a truck or a crane or a lawnmower.

The financier's valuation stirs our contempt; the individual is nothing except he can show the dollar sign which is his valuation of a man.

The militarist's estimate both saddens us and stirs our bitterest antagonism; to him the individual is either the instrument of destruction of his fellows, or he is gun-fodder.

The philosophic pessimist tells us the individual is an inconsequential atom to be lost eventually in the infinity of other atoms; or he is a bubble floating for a few moments on the stream of time, only to burst and be lost in the onward rushing flood.

How refreshing and how redemptive after these estimates is the attitude and the assurance of Jesus! To Him the individual in himself and by his inherent constitution and potentialities can count on his worth as infinite, through his possession of a soul, beside which barns and harvests and earthly goods are as nought.

So Jesus' program recognized primarily the spiritual value of the individual and aimed at the development of that; other values were mostly ignored. It was in relation to a man who was paralyzed—worthless economically—that Jesus said: "How much is a man better than a sheep!"

Next, the program of Jesus provides for the instruction of the individual. It has already been said that Jesus cultivated the individual. The interview with Nicodemus illustrates this: the greatest, most profound, and indispensable experience a human being can know was declared and emphasized at a midnight interview with one man. The deep spiritual teaching, under the figure of living water, was spoken to a heathen woman, who was also a bad woman, by a well-side in the heat of the day; and the surprise of the disciples that He talked with the woman finds something of like nature in us when we find Him taking such pains to cast such seed into such unpromising ground, until we see the result and acknowledge the Master-wisdom and Master-love and Master-grace.

So, if we follow His program we shall teach the individual and welcome the individual; and not the promising one alone, but also the unpromising, the possibly scornful, and argumentative, too. None were too insignificant for Him, none too slow, none too far gone in sin, neither were any too wise, or learned, to need His instruction; thus, when any person is thought to be worth our utmost

endeavor and utmost ability, in order that we may bring him into the kingdom by instruction, we are working the Master's program.

Again, Jesus dealt with the individual through sympathy. Even a cursory glance at his life and work shows that He regarded the sorrows of individuals as warranting the truest sympathy, and the exercise of supernatural power at times. The scene at the Gate of Nain opens to us the heart of Jesus. The widow's grief could not be passed over as a natural occurrence which must of necessity take place in every age and place; His attention is drawn away from the crowd about him and fixed on the one broken heart, which must be healed even if it should demand the most stupendous miracle to accomplish it. Let the procession stop! One heart in its sorrow can hold back a great multitude.

So, also, the timid touch of the poor woman with the issue of blood arrests His attention, though the crowd jostles him at the very moment. Virtue goes out of Him to the one and stops the crowd, and brings to her, not only physical healing, but also the greater blessing of spiritual healing and unforgettable Divine love. Doubtless, in His program is the healing of the body and the comforting of lives bowed with infirmities and crushed with griefs. No crowds and mass meetings must crowd this out. He instinctively felt the sorrows of lonely folk and shared and lifted them.

Of course, the deepest sympathy was reached when it dealt with the suffering of the soul. He was moved with compassion when He saw the *multitude* as shepherdless sheep; but He thought of the spiritual plight of the *one* when He spoke the parable of the Lost Sheep. One sinner repenting and gaining forgiveness awakens heaven's joy.

He saw me plunged in deep distress,
And flew to my relief:
For me He bore the shameful cross,
And carried all my grief.

In this relation, too, the atoning work of Jesus becomes individualized. He is the Son of God "who *loved me* and give himself *for me*." In the actual work of the kingdom this is of no common import. There are times and occasions when the universal aspect of the love of God and of the atoning work of Christ seem to bring no relief to the troubled heart and stricken soul; then there has to be the method of dealing which focuses the attention on the Saviour as the Shepherd

leaving the ninety and nine, and going after the one lost sheep.

Lord, thou hast here thy ninety and nine;
Are they not enough for thee?
But the Shepherd made answer: this of mine
Has wandered away from me.

Jesus lays stress on individual responsibility and freedom of action within certain limits. It would never have occurred to Him to ask: "Is man a machine?" With Him the will was supreme. He appealed to it as the final court. There could be no transferred responsibility. This was true of the surrender of life, of personal service and of final rewards. Each must decide for himself whether he will surrender his life to Him, accept His program, and each will be held responsible for his part and place in the kingdom, and each will receive his reward, if faithful. "To every one according to his ability," and not to every one alike, were the talents distributed. Neither were instructions given how to use the talents; that is left to individual initiative and personal choice. Jesus did not seek to force his disciples into a special mould and so fashion them all alike. He knew that personality was an asset to the kingdom; not a hindrance. To every one his work meant that each one had his own work, and he was left largely to do it in his own way.

When certain of his disciples began to reach out after greatness and authority and domination in the work of the kingdom, He told them they were being led astray and were giving place to the spirit which ruled the world; but which was out of place in the kingdom. We hear little from Jesus about leadership; but much about service. "He that would be greatest among you, let him be your servant." The incident of the foot-washing shows Jesus' attitude toward those who want to dominate things in the Church and to force their programs upon all others. "It shall not be so among you." When Peter with his usual impulsiveness said: "Lord and what shall this man do?" he received a reminder that he had better fix his attention on his own work and conduct.

Let us acknowledge, then, that Jesus' program provides for work in the Kingdom bearing the stamp of individuality which will not hinder or destroy the work of any other worker in the same Kingdom, but, will supplement it, and be the complement to it. At the same time, it is hard to find even provision for the machinery and the "cog in the

wheel" idea so prominent in the programs of today.

It is the knowledge of this that led an editor of one of our best religious weeklies to suggest that every minister should try for the coming year what he could accomplish in his own parish in his own way and by his own methods, ignoring conventions and hard and fast programs offered by others and putting himself and his personality at the use of the Kingdom among his own people. Such we conceive to be the perpetual program of Jesus for every worker in the Kingdom. Even the Gadarene found himself, after Jesus met him, and He set about his work in his own way and was successful. When the disciples would forbid the worker who "followed not us" the Master's "Forbid him not" was decisive.

It would seem to be one of the subtle dangers of the Church today that by theological training and by Church machinery, that individual approach to truth and that application of individual methods of working inside the Church, which are a great asset, shall be either eliminated or modified to the loss of both the worker and the Church. The limit of individual action is ultimately with the leading of the Divine Spirit.

Not the least important thing in the program is the provision for a full and sufficient illumination and guidance for all his disciples by Jesus. "One is your Master, even Christ," and then there is the "Spirit of Truth" who will guide into all truth. "He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." This provision has been amply vindicated in every life which has ventured upon it, whether it has been Paul, Martin Luther, John Wesley, William Booth, or the humblest worker for God. Neither will this action, under the illumination of the Divine Spirit lead to any insubordination to authority, which is also under Divine illumination; though it may lead to a disregard of some of those extra burdens wherewith some men seek to load others.

Bayport, New York.

So I was left alone and saw this great vision.—*Dan. 10:8.*

Love's secret is to be always doing things for God, and not to mind because they are such very little ones.—*Faber.*

For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, B.A.

The Shining Ray

THERE is a shining ray which in our time needs to be permitted to shine. Upon it depends our spiritual values. Ever since man has lived it has flickered in his heart. In the face of any catastrophe it has kindled his hope into the affirmation that beyond the sunset, beyond the shadows of the western sky, there is a kind spirit that will keep and love and care.

Mrs. Browning has said that earth outgrows the mythic fancies sung beside her in her youth. Here is a belief earth has never outgrown. Fancies, superstitions by the hundred, have been outgrown and cast aside. Here is a belief that has in it vitality which knows no waning. The paleontologist has dug up the remains of the bones of men who lived and struggled in the age of ice. Those prehistoric tribes of more than a hundred thousand years ago buried their trinkets and utensils in the grave for the use of the spirits that had left the body. It is a colossal fact that a race of beings through a hundred thousand years could hold steadily to the belief that the souls of men do not die at death. Such an affirmation that could survive the storms and revolutions of the changing seasons, an affirmation that no fire could burn and no dagger kill must have in it the vitality of God's undying truth.

Whenever I read of a man who declares death does not count, that the wise man does not concern himself, I wonder if the writer is referring to his own death or the death of those he honors, reverences and loves.

In *The Phaedo*, by Plato, I cannot find his arguments for immortality very convincing, but the *Phaedo* is a permanent contribution to the belief in immortality. Through that wonderful dialogue Plato keeps us thinking not about ourselves and what is going to happen to us, but about Socrates and what is going to happen to him.

Gradually he works up to the point where Socrates drinks the hemlock and passes away before our eyes. The thought that he is done for, that so great and beautiful a light has

flickered out forever is incredible. There you have immortality depending not upon the importance we attach to ourselves, but to those we love and honor. That is not ignoble. That is not egotistic.

I have known men in all philosophic calmness declare their indifference to life after death. Suddenly a little child, blood of their blood, passed away before their eyes. The passing of that child crushed them. They wanted that child to live. They were not concerned about immortality for themselves, but they wanted it for their children.

Carlyle in his biography said, "My life now has nothing in it but the shadow, sad, grand, unfathomable of what is coming, coming." When, however, Carlyle thought of the wife he lost he struck a different note. He could never believe she was gone forever, gone out into everlasting night. He writes,

At all hours and at all moments her transfigured spirit accompanies me; lies behind all the thoughts I have and even all the talk I carry on. If we are to meet, Oh Almighty Father, if we are.

There is nothing selfish in such a cry. It betokens a spirit that has become deeply implicated in the life of another. Goethe said the universe was the living garment of God. When Carlyle believed he declared from that time he began to live.

Whittier wrote:

Behind the cloud the starlight lurks,
Through showers the sunbeams fall,
For God, who loveth all his works,
Has left his hope with all.

Henry Thoreau*

HERE is a supreme American example of observation. He had his own speculations just as people have speculations about him. It seems no other human being left so complete a record of self-abnegation in the external world. He seems, however, never to be making observations to serve a purpose. He said, "I have given myself up to nature; I have lived so many springs and summers and autumns and winters as if I had nothing else to do but live them and imbibe whatever nu-

* Thoreau, *Journal* Vol. III.

triment they had for me; I have spent a couple of years, for instance with the flowers chiefly, having none other so binding an engagement as to observe when they opened; I could have afforded to spend a whole fall observing the changing tints of the foliage. Oh, how I have thriven on solitude and poverty."

Seals

THE seals come out of the water to rest. They bring forth their young ones in caves or sheltered nooks among the rocks. This tells the secret of the seals. They are the aquatic descendants of terrestrial mammals. It is a general natural history rule that animals go back to their old home to breed. The same is true in Alaska where fur seals have great rookeries.

Polar Bear

THE polar bear frequents the shore. It sometimes lies down beside an opening in the thick ice and waits for a seal to come up and breathe. With one stroke of its great arm it has been known to lift the seal right out of the water and send it crashing over the ice to be instantaneously killed.

Riches of the Bible

The Bible has been a quarry for sculptors, a gallery for painters, a text-book for orators, a standard for poets, and a dictionary of quotations for everybody. It was a fountain of melody to Handel, to Mendelssohn, to Haydn; a field of phantasmagoria to Dante; a spectrum of human life to Goethe; a consecrating oil to Shakespeare; a window in heaven and a light upon earth to Bunyan; a mystery of mysteries to Byron; and a pocket companion to Scott.

A Lovable Character

A woman famous as one of the most kindly and lovable among leaders of the best American society, tells: "If I have been able to accomplish anything in life, it is due to a word spoken to me in the right season, when I was a child, by my teacher. I was exceptionally ugly in personal appearance. One day my teacher found me crying. 'O madame, I am so ugly!' I sobbed out. Presently she took me to her room, and said, 'I have a present for you,' handing me a scaly, coarse

lump, covered with earth. 'Plant it and water it and give it sun for a week or two.' I planted it and watched it carefully; the green leaves came first, and at last the golden Japanese lily, the first I had ever seen. My teacher came to share my delight. 'Ah!' she said significantly, 'who would believe so much beauty and fragrance were shut up in that little rough ugly thing!' It was the first time that it ever occurred to me that in spite of my ugly face, I too might be able to win friends and make myself beloved in the world."

Mother's Bible

"What is the meaning of this?" said a minister, coming into a house and taking up a tattered copy of part of the Scriptures. "I don't like to see God's Word used so"—for indeed the book had been torn right in two. "O sir," said the owner of the half Bible, "do not scold until you hear how it came to be thus. That was my mother's Bible. When she died I could not part with it, and my brother could not part with it, we just cut it in two; and his half has been the power of God unto salvation to his soul, and my half has been the power of God unto salvation to mine."

A Beautiful Character

A Colporteur visited a cottage where lived a blind girl, and taught her to read with her fingers the books prepared for the blind. He got a Bible for her, which she read with intense delight. But in a short time the skin of her fingers got hardened, and she could not feel the letters. She cut off parts of the hardened skin and felt the letters; but it soon hardened again and she knew not what to do. To be unable to read her Bible was a sore trial to the poor girl. With a sorrowful heart and a tearful eye she took the book in her arms to give it a farewell kiss; when to her great joy, she discovered she could read it with her lips. Henceforth she read the precious Book in this manner, and gathered from its pages the words of life that were to her a consolation for daily trials.

Griffith John, the missionary, tells of a young Chinese convert who died recently. He entered the service of Christ more than a dozen years ago. The faithfulness and consistency of his new life were testified to by his native friends, who said of him, "There is no difference between him and the Book,"

Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

Topic for June 12

Do Christians Have Ambition? or, The Need of a Changed Heart

H. J. OCKENGA

Scripture—Exodus 20:17; Rom. 7:12-25.

COVETOUSNESS does not deal with things, but with an attitude of the heart. All of the specific items mentioned in this Commandment are prohibited also under the first, seventh, and eighth Commandments. But this command strips man of everything, and delves down into the cause of the violation of the other Commandments. It considers the depravity of the human heart. Emphasis is constantly being placed upon conditions by dissatisfied people. In reality the conditions ought not to be changed, but the heart of the man who made the conditions must be changed, for in the heart, if we may be allowed to call the seat of man's motivating forces the heart, lies the attitude and the condition that needs to be changed. Due to the misunderstandings that have been prevalent about this last of God's Words, three great questions must be discussed.

1. Contentment vs. Stoicism

The catechism says, "The tenth Commandment requireth full contentment with our own conditions." Does then this contentment give a substantial support to the status quo? Does it stifle progress, and does it wreck ambition? A true understanding of contentment as meant in this Westminster exposition would not allow of such an interpretation. The Bible says about Job that God had hedged him in. That is, that God had constructed a protection about Job out of which he could not go, either to his harm or to his own benefit. It is true that such a hedging takes place in most of our lives. It may be that we are hedged in by certain mental or physical limitations. Some men may never be scholars, and cannot hope to have the influence of a scholar. Some men who are cripples can never hope to be athletes or to do the things of an athlete. Some men are limited by blood ties, which will prevent them from rising to the heights in this world. Nevertheless, this ought not to prevent them from both being contented and dissatisfied.

Paul said, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased and how to abound." In this he meant that he had a contentment in whatsoever place the providence of God placed him. At times he was hungry, and naked and in jail, and yet these disturbing facts did not disturb his contentment, or his confident trust that all things work together for good. At other times, he lived upon the fat of the land, and was no more exalted in his luxury than he was in his deprivation.

Now this attitude is quite distinct from the

ancient stoicism of Zeno, or of Marcus Aurelius. God does not desire men to endure pain or unbearable situations simply with a calm resignation that kills all endeavor. The idea of taking life as it is and enduring it is not a Christian idea. The apathy that marks some lives and which manifests itself in the attitude that "what will be cannot be hindered or helped so why put forth an effort" is also un-Christian. The contentment about which this Commandment deals is not similar to that pantheistic resignation of the eastern religions. The teaching that one must resign himself to his caste in Hinduism, or to his fate in Mohammedanism is entirely distinct from this idea. God says that there is to be a contentment that marks your life, but it is such that it will not militate against progress.

2. Ambition vs. Envy

How is this teaching on contentment to be reconciled with ambition and with the other scriptural statements, such as to earnestly covet the best gifts? Entirely compatible with contentment is a sense of dissatisfaction. This sense of unrest might be described as zealous striving. The Christian is content and yet it is said of him that he shall only be satisfied when he awakes in the likeness of Christ. That shall not be till the resurrection morn. He is always striving to become more like Christ. He is always thirsting for the righteousness of Christ, and hungering for the Word of God. And yet co-existent with this there is a sense in which he is satisfied and his hunger appeased. Satisfied, yet reaching out; contented, yet hoping; hedged in, yet overcoming his limitations, this is the picture of man from the Christian standpoint.

This ambition is quite distinct from covetousness. The latter might be defined as the regret that others have what we are not privileged to enjoy. It is the spirit of the one who says, "If I can't have it, no one shall." The prevalence of this sin is made manifest by the presence in almost everyone's life of a sort of smug satisfaction in the misfortune of others. The meaning of that is simply that we are glad to see our competitors brought lower that we might appear to be higher. And sad to say, this finds its expression in every realm of life, even sometimes degenerating to the level of one man defaming another that he might take his place. Sometimes covetousness resolves itself into lust, which breaks either the seventh or the first Commandment. The lust for wealth has caused more than one man to ruin many legitimate business enterprises of his competitors that their wealth might fall into his hands. And we need not mention the number of homes that have been wrecked by another kind of covetousness which has turned into lust. Of this God says, "No covetous man shall inherit the Kingdom of God," because "he is an idolator," and because "the Lord abhorreth him."

The difference then between ambition and covetousness is this: holy ambition is something that not only brings us upward in our life's struggle, but that brings others upward with us. It is an unselfish thing, it is that which does not crush someone else of his possession for our own advancement. Calling this ambition, dissatisfaction, we thus recognize that there is a harmony between it and contentment. Dr. Charles Hodge says, "A cheerful and contented disposition is perfectly compatible with a due appreciation of the good things of this world, and diligence in the use of all proper means to improve our condition in life."

3. The Gospel vs. The Law

In the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, God gave the specific promise of a new covenant, that is, of a time when He would put His law on the inward parts, and write it in the heart, when He would be Israel's God, and they should be His people. It should be a time when no longer they would have to teach every man his neighbor, saying, "Know the Lord," for everyone shall know Him, even the least of them unto the greatest. That passage promises that the heart of the Israelitish nation should one day be changed, so that they would not have to obey the law, but they would love to obey it. That change shall consist of a change in the heart attitude of the whole nation.

According to Paul, that time for Israel is yet in the future. But in the meantime, the promise is fulfilled individually to every believing Christian. It is not necessary to obey the law because we have to, but we obey it because we love to. Our hearts have been changed in their desires, both toward God and toward things. This Commandment implied this change. The Gospel was preached in the law. Though one may feel that he has fulfilled the Commandments, up until the tenth one, he must here feel exactly as one feels when reading the sermon on the mount, for this is heart religion, and man is condemned if he does not possess it.

This was the condition of Paul which he records in the seventh chapter of Romans. Living under the law he had worshipped the true God and had been zealous in his service for Him. He had never outwardly violated any of the first nine Commandments. But when he came to study the tenth Commandment probably under Gamaliel, he found that he was flagrantly guilty of its violation, and that in practically every part of his life. Through this Commandment, Paul saw the inadequacy of the covenant of works with men possessing a depraved nature. It was impossible to obey the law, which must be done perfectly if one is to be saved through it. Hence, he turned to the covenant of grace made through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Men who find themselves through a knowledge of the Commandment, especially the tenth Commandment, "sold under sin" or bound in fetters to death, spiritual death, as Paul says he was, may take hope through Jesus Christ. For man is made again morally perfect through Christ's perfect obedience to the covenant of works, which is imputed unto the unbeliever when he accepts the substitution of Christ for him, both in penalty bearing and in life obedience before God. This man may then say, "O, how love I thy law," for

the love of God is placed in his heart anew, and the covenant is inscribed upon his heart.

QUESTIONS

1. Why are men not content today? What are some of the great marks of the restlessness surging over the hearts of men?
2. What Christian experience is necessary for the peace of God? Is contentment in life based upon a rational explanation of the universe?
3. How is envy sometimes manifested in art, literature, politics and religion? What is the best antidote for envy?
4. What kind of ambition does God expect us to have?

Topic for June 19

What is Man?

EARL E. ALLEN

Scripture—Psalm 8; Genesis 1:27; Acts 17:28, 29; John 1:12, 13; 1 John 3:1, 2.

D. R. T. E. LAWSON, writing in the London *Observer*, gives the following as the ingredients which make up the average man:

Enough water to fill a ten-gallon barrel. Enough fat for seven bars of soap. Carbon for 9,000 lead pencils. Phosphorus to make 2,200 match heads. Magnesium for one dose of salts. Iron to make one medium-sized nail. Sufficient lime to whitewash a chicken coop, and sulphur enough to rid one dog of fleas.

Some persons, trying to answer our question, would have us believe that man is nothing more than these elements. A certain school of modern philosophers tries to lead us to believe that man is merely a form of animal life which has run up a blind alley. Because it is unnatural for animals to think in such detail and to curb their natural desires this school believes that man will become extinct in a comparatively short time.

The teaching of our Bible cries out against the idea that man is only an animal. The religious singer asks the question, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him and the son of man that thou visitest him"? Christian teaching sends back the answer, Man is a creature in the image of God, a creature in the making, a son of God.

1. A Creature in the Image of God

In the midst of theories as to man's origin, we read in Genesis 2:7,

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

Science teaches us today that man's body is made of the same elements as the soil, thus proving that the author of Genesis was not wrong in writing of dust as the stuff God used to create man.

But it was the breath of life which God breathed into the body which He had constructed that made man like his Creator. Without this spirit man was merely a combination of cells and organs; with this spirit he was infinitely more—a living soul—a son of God.

Because he is a person and not an animal, man is able to reflect so that he need not be just a creature of impulse and instinct. When a horse takes a drink of water he does not stop to think that the water may be contaminated with typhoid fever germs. But because he is able to think, a man may refuse to drink water and may even send it away to be analyzed by a chemist. Man is more than animal because he is able to reflect.

As the result of reflection man is able to choose intelligently. A woman goes out into the chicken yard and all of the chickens flock around her. They do not notice that she does not have her usual pail of food. The chickens are creatures of habit and instinct so much that they cannot choose what to do in the light of knowledge. Our society is built upon the idea that men are free to choose between right and wrong. If persons were not able to keep from crime we would be very wrong to put them in jail or to punish them for their wrongdoing. But man is a choosing being and rises above the animals in his power of choice.

2. A Creature in the Making

When God created man He did not make a finished product like a machine. He merely gave man powers of development and sent him to school in the school of life. Man, the species, has been growing for thousands of years, learning God's truth or swallowing the lies of evil. Each generation not only grows culturally and spiritually because of its own experience but because of the experience of men in the past which has been preserved. Likewise, individual persons like you and me develop and grow for good and evil all through life. We not only are here now but we are also becoming different for the future. Our spirits are constantly changing, just as our bodies are changing. Man grows with the help of the future as well as with the help of the past. In Jesus Christ man has a revelation of God and the way of life which brings most joy and satisfaction here and hereafter. In the light of this highest revelation man sets high standards and goals for himself and strives with the help of God to live up to the very highest that he knows and desires to be. Or he may, like a rivulet, take the crooked course of least resistance.

Progress is the first demand of spiritual life. Stagnation is death. Through constant prayer and life pointed toward the highest revelation of Jesus Christ man receives power from above to mount higher. As our light increases, our ideals enlarge and our spirits grow as we reach out to realize our ideals. As Gilbert Chesterton says,

One does not pat a crocodile on the back and say, "Now, be a crocodile" for he is already a crocodile and can be nothing else. But one does say to his fellowman, "Now be a man."

The Spirit of Christ living within man unifies his life and best helps him to be the highest kind of a man.

3. A Son of God

"As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," wrote Paul in his letter to the Romans.—Rom. 8:16.

This triumphant Christian faith rises above the hopeless belief that man is an animal in a blind alley as the butterfly rises above his old crawling caterpillar self.

Today, Christ calls us to leave our low-vaulted past or present to be born of the Spirit of God so that we may be the true spiritual sons of God. It is man's privilege to be God's heir jointly with Jesus Christ. That means to have fellowship with the Heavenly Father as Jesus had. Think of the power which Jesus had to overcome the great temptations which were constantly coming to him. Think of Jesus' victory over sin and death. That

same victory, that same highest joy, that same nobility is the heritage of man—the man who chooses the way of God's will for his life. Instead of seeing how close to evil he can come without suffering great harm, such a man stays as far away from evil indulgences as possible, and as close to God—whom he loves supremely—as he can get.

A Quaker was looking for a coachman. The first man who applied said that he could drive to within six inches of a precipice with safety. He was not hired. The second applicant said that he could approach to within an inch and a half of the edge of the cliff without going over. He too went the way of the unemployed. The third man to apply said that he would stay as far away as possible from such a place of danger. The Quaker said, "I am willing to entrust my life with thee," and hired him on the spot. The attitude of the last man is a safe Christian attitude toward evil.

Conclusion

What is man? Christian faith answers, "He is a creature created in the image of God—a reflecting, choosing, loving being." The man who fully accepts and follows Jesus Christ—the Man—to him God gives the power to become his true spiritual son.

FOR DISCUSSION

1. What does modern science say about man's origin? Does it go far enough?
2. To what extent do you think man is free to choose between right and wrong? What things influence him in his choice?
3. Is a person really good if he is forced to do right? Why?
4. Is anyone all good or all bad? When is a person good enough to be called a spiritual son of God?
5. What does science say about man's life after death? What is the answer of Christianity to the question of immortality?

Topic for June 26 Where is Your Light?

EARL E. ALLEN

Scripture—Matt. 5:14-16; Mark 4:21, 22; Luke 12:35.

THE words of Jesus to His disciples search our lives today:

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick? Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

But if you have no light, or if the light of Christian truth and the warmth of Christian devotion is not glowing but hidden, what shall it avail? What shall it profit any one if you have the light of Christian truth and share not that truth? Is your light:

1. Under a Bushel?

How empty are the results of hiding your light under a bushel—an empty measure. Some of you are surrounding the light of your lives with the narrow limits of an empty measure of interests. Some of you imagine that life has yielded its full measure of returns if you have satisfied the cravings of your physical appetites. You experience the satisfaction which comes to you from eating a large meal. Do your physical appetites limit your souls so that your light cannot get past them?

Men's souls live by the light of life which is shared. In the play, "What Men Live By" a poor Russian shoemaker is trying to eke out an existence among the poor peasant folk of his village. His wife complains of their poverty. They have only one sheepskin coat between them to protect them from the severe winter weather. One day the shoemaker goes out to shop. On the way he finds a ragged young man on the steps of the village church. He feels sorry for the homeless fellow and takes him home with him to a warm fire, a bed of straw, and a crust of bread. The shoemaker's wife resents the presence of the needy man. Shall the shoemaker listen to the voice of the Master, "I was an hungered and ye took me in"—or to the voice of his wife? He wavers, but finally his better nature wins out and he convinces his wife that they must try to do something for poor Michael.

Time goes by and Michael becomes an expert shoemaker and the best people of the village flock to the shoe shop for shoes. It is Michael's presence which has brought success. If the shoemaker had listened to the voice of selfishness his light would have gone out under a restricted bushel. He shed his light; it grew until the whole village was brighter.

2. Under a Bed?

Ever since you were trying to escape from the judgment of your parents in the folly of childhood, under a bed has been a traditional hiding place for some of you. This out-of-the-way place under the bed may be a good place to store some of the least needed things of life, but to put the light of the gospel of Christ in such a place is spiritual stagnation and death.

Shoving the light of Christian living aside under the bed means that that light shines not where you are living, where you and others are facing life's crucial problems at least sixteen hours of the day. It means that the light which you should be radiating is nearest to you when you are asleep.

There is an old American custom of sleeping over the problems of life. If some one has a sudden impulse to get married or to sell a farm or to start a business his friends tell him to "sleep over it." If sleeping over life's problems means thinking them through, certainly you would be for "sleeping over" the light of the Christian living until you learned its true significance. But for too many persons putting the light of Christian helpfulness under the bed means going to sleep religiously. In order that the light of Christian truth may make you free from the law of sin and death you must know it, practice it, demonstrate it.

In the play, "The Servant in the House" the Bishop of India plays the role of the servant and sets an English vicar and his wife as well as a rough desperado on the right trail of life. The Bishop of India has led to the transformation of a large portion of native India because he has shed around him the light of Christian service. In contrast to him is a bishop of England. Fat, self-righteous, desiring to cheat the sincere people of the country to feather his own nest, the English bishop is a perfect picture of hypocrisy. He is hiding the light of religion under his bed and has gone to sleep over his religion.

3. At the Window?

Profiteering will never build the Christian community. It is only by profit-sharing, through an equitable distribution of wealth that you can hope to be unselfishly helpful to others. Did you ever stop to think about the impossibility of monopolizing spiritual light? Who can monopolize love, and peace, and the joy which comes from serving others and living nobly? Who would try to get a "corner" on forgiveness and spiritual success? You can monopolize stocks and bonds and "greenbacks," but you cannot monopolize Christian friendship. The more you give the more you have. How much light of Christian helpfulness have you shared this last week? You rejoice in the happiness which comes when you believe that your sins are forgiven and that you are a true son of God. Does that experience of joy and peace in fellowship with God mean so much that you long to share it with others?

At Christmas time some folks have beautifully decorated Christmas trees away back in their houses where only the members of their own families can enjoy them. Other people place their beautiful Christmas trees in the front window where all who pass by can appreciate them. By putting the Christmas lights in windows no one loses and many gain. Christmas cheer and joy should always be fresh in the hearts and lives of those to whom the child-like Christ-spirit is ever coming with new spiritual life. Has your Christian life windows through which shine the light of Him whose Spirit dwells within you?

Conclusion

If you are Christian in belief and deed, light has penetrated into your soul. Your life is bright with the good cheer of Christian light. You cannot keep that light by hiding it under a bushel or under a bed. Because the love in your heart constrains you, you must put your light in life's window to share your joy and good cheer.

FOR DISCUSSION

1. What are some of the ways by which we may shed our light in this community?
2. Are we doing all that we should to evangelize young people? How could we improve the soul-winning work of our organization?
3. Has it been your experience that non-Christian young people resent it when Christian young people try to let their lights shine among them? Give examples.
4. What are some of the common excuses given by Christian people for hiding their lights? Which ones are good excuses?
5. Do you think it is possible to be too aggressive as a Christian torch-bearer? Give reasons.

Topic for July 3

Who Sent Us?

EARL E. ALLEN

Scripture—John 9:4; Matt. 28:18-20; Matt. 10.

Introduction

MRS. A. STARR BEST, an authority on religious drama, says that many of our modern plays are exceedingly poor because they have no purpose. Practically all that they are is brilliant dialogue thrown into a revolving circle of circumstances. Too many of our modern dramas in real life get nowhere because they lack purpose.

In contrast to purposeless lives of dissatisfaction are God-commissioned lives. Can you imagine a person whose soul was exultant because it was sent by God to bless others easily turning aside into a by-path of despair? Do we feel that we are commissioned by God to represent Christ to every one whom we meet?

1. The Tarrying Unsent

Mildred was a good-looking, healthy, talented girl of seventeen. Any one who met her would think that life meant much to her. But Mildred had no moving purpose giving direction to her life. No mastering ideal drew from her the potential fineness of her young womanhood. No challenging Director of life had sent her with fast-beating heart and glistening, eager eyes and loving hands to teach the national leaders of tomorrow, or to bind up the wounds of the maimed, or to plead for the justice of the abused. She had not received her commission. She was tarrying—marking time—because she was unsent. All around us we see persons like Mildred.

2. Self-Sent

We have met persons who have been self-sent. Such persons are self-important, overbearing, inconsiderate of the welfare of others. The self-sent player on the baseball diamond puts his prowess above good sportsmanship and above the welfare of the whole team. A young woman in a certain church society was a person of this type. She was a very capable worker but she did not have the fine sense of considering the point of view of any one else. If her plans did not go through unchanged she was mean; if any one differed from her she always considered the other to be wrong. This woman never gave those who knew her the sense of going about among them as one who served, one who was working solely for the welfare of the Kingdom of God. Of such is the downfall of Christian service.

We often hear the term "self-made." After this fashion we speak of Lincoln as a "self-made" man. But Lincoln himself once said, "All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother." Even "self-made" persons owe much to others and they are truly great only if they recognize and acknowledge this debt. Persons who are merely "self-sent" cannot get beyond the barrier of their own imperfections. In spite of ourselves we are shaped by the tremendous power of outside influences upon us, making us one way or another.

3. Man-Sent

In the early days of the British invasion of India the missionaries were sent out by the East India Company. As a result the missionaries baptized the natives by the wholesale. Sent out by a commercial company they tried to commercialize religion. The natives, herded together and led into rivers like cattle, were ignorant of the real significance of baptism and of Christianity. These missionaries were not commissioned of God to brave the hardships of life in India to transform the lives of persons. They were man-sent and the motives of the traders who sent them were selfish.

In order that we may work effectively in any enterprise we must follow leaders but we have a right to choose our leaders, to consider whether their motives are selfish or unselfish, and whether

or not they are leading in the right direction. We are man-commissioned, but do we know who has commissioned us? Are we following blindly—perhaps to work the works of selfish greed or dogmatic unbelief?

4. God-Sent

The men and women who have done most to make the world better have had the firm conviction that God sent them to their field of labor. For them their life work was a great commission. Once they set their hands to the plow they never turned back from the demands of their commission.

When the Danish East India Company was looking for missionaries to go to India it could find no God-called men in all of Denmark who would respond. They feared the tropical heat and squalor of India. They feared the Bengal tigers and hostile natives and so the trading company went down into Germany and found some Pietists who were not only willing but eager to carry the good news of Christ. These men were God-sent and the terrors of a thousand jungles could not have stopped them.

All through Jesus' ministry that abiding conviction that his Heavenly Father had sent Him to minister to needy mankind kept Him going straight ahead from the Jordan river to Golgotha.

What every one of us needs is a commission from God. We need to place our all at the disposal of God. We need to hear His question as He considers the problems of our community and our world, "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" We need to have the spiritual satisfaction of saying to God in the secret depths of our personalities, "Here am I, Lord. Send me!"

Are we young people with our youthful enthusiasm God's Apostles? Apostles are persons whom God sends into all of the relationships of life to sow the seeds of His love and His truth. They work through the channels of the church in the community to make people, young and old, in our own households and in our own fellowship new creatures in Christ Jesus. To be God-sent is not to drive people into goodness with whips of force. It is to say to God in the secrecy of our own chambers, "Father, we recognize our own weaknesses. We recognize that we cannot send ourselves out into these relationships of life to represent Thee. Father, strengthen us with the irresistible power of thy loving Spirit so that we may win men, women, and little children for Thee." The God-commission is God speaking to our own souls and saying to us, "Go ye into all world relationships which are yours, and bathe people of all nations in my Spirit which you represent."

Conclusion

Do we lack purpose in our lives? Is it because no one has sent us? or because we have sent ourselves? or because some one has sent us who is not God's messenger? Has God sent us? If God gives us a great commission we are His modern apostles who can never be turned back from the task which He has given us to do.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Do you think workers in the Church other than the minister should be "called"? Why?
2. If workers in the church really had the interests of the kingdom at heart would they enter into a quarrel over church work under any provocation? Discuss.

3. What does receiving a call from God mean to you?

4. Do you think that God calls apostles and prophets today as surely as He did Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, and Paul? Give reasons.

5. What relation is there between a declining consciousness of God's Presence and a large reduction in giving for missionary work?

6. How can we be sure that it is God who has called us and that we are not "on the wrong track"?

Lord give to me that simple love
Which kept the heart of Daniel pure;
That I may undefiled be,
And hold my faith in God secure.

The things I eat, the things I drink,
May they increase my strength and mind;
That wisdom in thy word and law
May be like purest gold refined.

May I not bow to other gods,
But practice daily prayer and praise,
And let my enemies observe
I walk with God in all his ways.

And whether reading his designs,
Or facing beasts within the den;
Or ruling as his minister,
Lord keep me still a prince of men.

Thy ways are good for youth today,
As for the Israelites of old;
Keep me as pure and undefiled,
And for the truth keep me as bold.

The Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

The Taproot of Religion

A NEW book published by The Macmillan Company, New York, carries the suggestive title, *The Taproot of Religion and Its Fruitage*. The author is Professor Charles F. Sanders, D.D., who occupies the chair of Philosophy in Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., an institution which operates under the auspices of the United Lutheran Church in America. He has held that position for many years. The book is of such a character as to require more than a brief notice. It is not a book that is easy to read or analyze.

What are its merits? Has it any constructive value? In reply we would say: it has value in that it upholds religion as a real experience demanding an objective personal source. The very fact that man is almost universally religious is a phenomenon that demands an explanation. What is the only adequate explanation of this outstanding phenomenon? That religion is a reality; an experience impinged on the human soul by a supernatural power. Materialism and mechanism can give no adequate account of such an experience. An age that claims to have the scientific spirit should try to furnish a rational explanation of the phenomenon of a mystic experience, and has no right to try to explain it away.

As an argument, therefore, against the materialistic science of our day the book is constructively timely and valuable. Dr. Sanders is reiterative, almost tiresomely so, in

insisting on a mystical experience as a reality just as clearly evident and as well validated as is sensory experience. It may be that his hammering on the fact over and over again will make some indentation on the minds of the mechanistic scientists of our unhappy times.

Another merit of the book is the author's repeated contention that there is no antagonism between true religion and true science. He fails, we must admit, to give any details, and makes no effort to show their harmony by appeal to facts; but perhaps again his constant emphasis on this point will finally make some impression on the mentality of the anti-religious scientists. At least, we hope so.

Moreover, he argues quite cogently for the right to exercise faith in religion as elsewhere, and shows with some pungency that nothing great and progressive has ever been accomplished, even in the realm of science, without faith. He sees no disagreement between knowledge or reason and faith. In religion faith gives "the reality of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1). He declares his belief that Christianity is the true religion (p.261).

And what, according to our author, is the taproot of religion? As far as we can determine, it is the mystic experience of the soul in finding God and holding communion with Him. Sometimes he seems to find it in the aspiring nature of human personality, which

cannot be satisfied with mere material things.

In the next place, what are some of the shortcomings of the book? We admit regretfully that it seems to us to have a good many. We shall point out what we regard as some of them.

First, we do not think that his arguments for the agreement of religion and science are thoroughgoing enough, or sufficiently detailed and specific. He is assertive rather than argumentative and persuasive. Nowhere does he show how, or even attempt to show how, a *modus vivendi* between religion and science can be established. For example, he believes in evolution (pp.179,180,183). But he fails to show how this theory can be reconciled with the Biblical teaching concerning the creation of the universe, of life, of species and of man. Where does the Bible give the remotest hint that man was evolved from an animal ancestry? Nowhere. On the contrary, it says explicitly, so that any intelligent child can understand, that the first man could not find "an help meet for him" among all the animals that passed before him in order that he might name them (Gen.2:20). And, moreover, where is there any conclusive evidence in the natural realm that any animal ever evolved into a human being, or that any specific kind of life has evolved into another kind?

A serious fault of the book is that the author nowhere makes any clear statement of his attitude toward the cardinal tenets of the Christian religion. One wonders what is his attitude toward the Bible and toward its great doctrines—the Trinity, the deity and pre-existence of Christ, the miracles of the Bible, the atonement wrought by our Lord on the cross, the resurrection of Christ and His second coming. Again, in delineating the mystic experience, he seems to mix together all kinds of religious experiences. He fails to show that a Christian experience is very different in content and clarity from the experiences connected with the ethnic religions. Even Gandhi recently admitted that he had not found God. Dr. Sanders seems to put all religious experiences into the same category—those of Moses, Socrates, Paul, Kant and Gandhi. Why, as a professed believer in Christianity, did he not clearly differentiate between Christian experience and other mystical experiences?

We cannot understand why an evangelical Christian should side in with Abelard

against Bernard. The former was one of the most outstanding liberalists of the middle ages, while Bernard was a gifted and spiritually minded orthodox Biblicist. The substitutional atonement, clearly taught in the Bible, was rejected by Abelard and upheld by Bernard. Yet Dr. Sanders declares that religious thinking since that time has gone after Abelard (p.89). Of course, the Modernists of our day naturally follow Abelard, but the great body of evangelical Christians do not, cannot and will not.

The treatment accorded by Dr. Sanders to the conflict between Fundamentalism and Modernism is, we are sorry to say, very superficial, revealing lack of careful investigation and accurate thinking. He says that he is not sure he understands the meaning of the terms used, but he thinks that they stand for extreme conservatism, on the one hand, and extreme progressivism, on the other.

That is far from a correct statement of the situation. If the author does not even feel sure that he knows the meaning of the terms used, would it not have been better for him to find out their meaning before he pronounced a judgment upon them? It behooves us, therefore, to point out clearly the differences between the two parties.

First, they differ in their respective attitudes toward the Bible. The Fundamentalists believe that the Bible is the fully inspired Word of God, just as does the United Lutheran Church, of which Dr. Sanders is a clerical member. For the confessional position of that body, see Article I of its Doctrinal Basis. The Modernists deny the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and accept only what appeals to their subjective views, just as did the German rationalists and negative critics of the nineteenth century. They often make their so-called mystic experience the final court of appeal over against the Bible.

To go into the matter a little more in detail. The Fundamentalists, accepting the Bible at its face value, accept the following clearly revealed Biblical doctrines, while the Modernists reject them, or doubt them, or do not regard them as fundamental to the Christian system: the Trinity, the true deity of Christ, His pre-existence, His virgin birth, the Biblical miracles, the substitutional atonement, the resurrection of Christ, the resurrection of all men at the last day, and the apocalyptic second coming of

Christ. Thus our author can see that the difference between the two parties is vital and unbridgeable. The controversy is not merely an ill-natured quarrel, as he seems to think. In such a case a man ought to indicate clearly where he stands. There is no middle-of-the-road place to walk in with comfort and consistency. The whole Lutheran Church, if true to its doctrinal basis, stands with the Fundamentalists insofar as the above-mentioned doctrines are concerned.

It is to be noted that Dr. Sanders believes in the organized church. Of course, it is evident on the face of it that Christianity could make no progress if Christian people were not organized for their work. But we think he is too critical. He simply cannot refrain from finding fault. By over-doing the critical business he puts a club into the hands of the foes of Christianity and the church. He does not seem to believe in denominations at all, and would appear to be an out-and-out syncretist (unionist); but he fails to suggest any way by which people who differ can come together in an organized body. The worst church fights going on today are not among the various denominations, but are *within* the denominations between the Evangelicals and the Modernists. In fact, the Modernists are the chief cause of the present controversy in nearly all the branches of Protestantism.

Our next criticism is somewhat serious, especially as far as concerns the Lutheran Church. On page 241 our author endorses Melancthon's synergism and his doctrine of faith and conversion. On account of his synergistic teaching, Melancthon was not favored by the Lutheran Church, and his doctrine of faith was rejected. Dr. Sanders regards this treatment of Melancthon's views as a great misfortune for religion.

Well, unfortunately for Dr. Sanders' theology, the whole Lutheran Church in America (and elsewhere as well) does not follow the teaching of Melancthon on the points specified, but unanimously adopts the *Unaltered* Augsburg Confession; and by their very use of the word "Unaltered" they mean to assert that they do not accept the *Variata* of Melancthon. This is, of course, the position of the United Lutheran Church (see Article III of its Doctrinal Basis).

Nor do we assent to Dr. Sanders' allegation that the Lutheran view of faith is not the result of the inductive method; for surely a real Christian experience knows that no

one can accept the Lord Jesus Christ by saving faith until the power to do so is begotten within him by the Holy Spirit. Of course, the natural man may have a kind of mystical experience, as our author says, but that is not the faith which forms the condition of *Christian* experience.

Some people, we fear, have a wrong conception of Christian faith. Dr. Sanders, for example, says that for fifteen hundred years faith has been regarded as a work of God. Then he goes on to argue that this view of faith makes God an arbitrary God. Why, then, does He not beget faith in everybody?

But surely that is a misconception of the Biblical doctrine of Christian faith, as well as of the psychological principles involved. It runs up squarely against the teaching of Paul, who says: "By grace are ye saved through faith: and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God" (Eph.2:8). This is not an arbitrary procedure on God's part. The Holy Spirit is willing and anxious to give all people the ability of faith if they desire it. Even if men are sinful, their mentality and their senses have not been destroyed. The Holy Spirit can still reach their mentality through their hearing or reading of the law and the gospel; then when He confers the ability of faith upon them through vocation, enlightenment and regeneration, they must exercise it and accept Christ as their Saviour. Thus men are justified by faith and saved by grace and not on account of human merit. We fear the doctrine advocated in Dr. Sanders' book would mean Pelagianism, or at least Semi-Pelagianism. Paul sets forth the true doctrine: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; . . . because they are spiritually discerned." So does Christ: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except any one (Greek, *tis*) be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Dr. Sanders proposes a substitute for the time-honored Apostles' Creed. We were minded to print this modernized version and the ancient creed in parallel columns, so that our readers could see how labored, abstract and impersonal the former is in contrast with the simple, concrete and personal character of the latter; but we note that the publishers forbid the reproduction of any part of the book without written permission from them. As we do not care to trouble them for such permission, we have carefully refrained, in the foregoing review, from making any quotations from Dr. Sanders' book.—L. S. K.

The Origin and Growth of Religion

A BOOK REVIEW BY W. BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc.

(The following is a review of a book entitled *The Origin and Growth of Religion: Facts and Theories*, by W. Schmidt, Professor in the University of Vienna; translated from the original German by Professor H. J. Rose, M.A. Published by Methuen & Co., Ltd., 36 Essex St., London, W.C.2. 15 shillings. As this book came to our desk too late for review by the editor, Dr. Dawson has kindly, at our request, sent us his estimate and analysis of this learned treatise, which is attracting much attention among scholars. Perhaps we shall have something more to say about it in the next number of this magazine.—L. S. K.)

THE author has under publication a large work in four volumes, entitled, *The Origin of the Idea of God*; which gives the results of his exhaustive researches. But the need was felt for "a manual giving a brief review of all that is essential for an understanding of the subject;" and this manual of 302 pages, with full indexes, bears the above title.

The general method of the author is the investigation of the beliefs of the most primitive tribes to be found anywhere on the various continents, to determine what is most primary in religion and in the idea of God. He claims that the earth is now so thoroughly explored that only a few remote peoples are still to be discovered; and that the conclusion which can now be reached is not one of many transitory theories, to be replaced by some other, but "an entire and therefore an enduring truth." His book gives a full review and discussion of all types of primitive religions, such as Nature-myths, Fetishism, Animism, etc; and his conclusion is that the worship of the High God is the most primary; that is, the monotheistic worship of one supreme God.

The reason that other theories have gained such wide currency and popularity he attributes to the erroneous view that religion is necessarily a development in conformity with Evolution. According to this view, whatever is most degrading and lowest must come first; and any high or exalted view is necessarily a later development. This conception has put scholars on an entirely wrong track, and has biased their judgment; and we wish therefore to draw attention to what this thorough investigation has to say on the subject.

Almost at the beginning of his book, he points out that,

in the whole domain of ethnology, the old evolutionary school is bankrupt. The long single lines of development . . . have been shattered and overthrown. . . . The historians of culture in particular have set about clearing away the remnants of Evolutionism.

In view of "the ruins of the former evolutionist system," the research worker

may tremble lest the building which he would fain rear should prove to be but another link in the long chain of errors in the history of religion which have passed over the world (Chap.II, Sect.1).

A concise summary of the various theories of the origin of religion is given; and the following remarks are then made upon them and the methods involved:

All the theories we have mentioned (except nature-myths) were under the sway of progressivist Evolutionism, that is to say, they assumed that religion began with lower forms, and explained all its higher manifestations, especially monotheism, as the latest in time, the products of a long process of development.

But towards the end of the nineteenth century, Andrew Lang pointed to certain high gods found among very primitive peoples (regarded as creators and founders of the moral code). These could not therefore be the products of a long development. Lang's work "was received at first with general opposition—then with still more general silence."

All the theories (with the exception above mentioned) "came into being after the outbreak of materialism and Darwinism;" their work being done on "evolutionist lines," which puts "all that is low and simple at the beginning, all that is higher and of worth being regarded only as the product of development." This was easy to arrange, as there was no writing to give evidence of order; which could only be determined "by help of the evolutionist method, which is really no method at all, as we shall see later."

"An end was put to this unhappy state of affairs, which governed the whole of ethnology, by the school of cultural history." This arose about 1886, and was carried forward by various leaders till 1910 when the author brought out his work on the Pygmies, followed by his later description of the South-east Australians. "The primitive high gods, which Lang had been the first to value aright, were therein set in their proper perspective, and thus made of permanent value."

This was confirmed by the ideas and beliefs of primitive tribes on other continents, investigated later; and there is strong evidence that their culture is of the most primitive type. (See Chap. XIV, part *d* and Chap. XV, Sect. 1, *a*.)

The inquiries which led to the earlier theories, had been conducted in a spirit which led to

An increasing inability to grasp the deeper essence of religion, to give due value to its higher forms, and a tendency to overestimate the outward elements and underestimate, or entirely neglect, the spirit.

This showed the effect of materialism, strengthened by a doctrine of progressive Evolution, the fruit of Darwinism in natural science (Chap. II, Sect. 4, *b*).

The author is simply trying to ascertain the beliefs of the most primitive tribes; he makes no comparisons with the Bible at all. Yet much that he discovers can be explained only by the account of early man in Genesis.

For example, most tribes believe that the Supreme Being used to live in this world; He then taught men many things, including the moral law; but because of some sin of mankind, He went up to heaven where He now lives (pp. 264, 265). Many tribes hold that God sees and hears all that men do and say both day and night, for the stars are His eyes; or, as others think, the sun and moon are His eyes and the stars His ears (p. 270). All these primitive peoples everywhere recognize that the Supreme Being is wholly good, and think that evil is due to another being, who meets all His beneficence with protests and hindrances. Regarding this evil

being and his origin, they are not clear; but in any case he is inferior and subordinate to the Supreme Being (pp. 263, 271).

In the worship of the Supreme Being there is little that can be done; though the ideas about prayer are very interesting (p. 278). Almost the only thing is gratitude; for God not only made the world and men, but provided food. Thanksgiving for food, and an offering of food to acknowledge this, are about all that can be done. In this they have the advantage of some people of higher culture. He rules out the idea that sacrifice originated in "feeding the dead" (pp. 280, 281).

When we come to creation, all these primitive peoples have a fairly clear notion that God is the Creator; and many tribes (indeed, most of them) are quite definite about it. (See "Creative Power," pp. 272, 273, and other discussions of this topic). It is very remarkable to find so universal a belief in divine creation when the learned moderns are bending their intelligence to account for nature on evolutionary lines. Once again it may be said, these things are hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed to babes.

The whole conclusion of this book seems to show that these primitive beliefs must have come down from the conditions which the Bible depicts at the beginning; when God spake with man openly; and man lost touch with God through sin. The knowledge of the true God and of creation are primary; not the result of long "development," or a view reached by men after centuries of thought and reasoning, as the critics would have us suppose.

Montreal, Canada

Reviews of Recent Books

The Basis of the Evolutionary Faith. By Floyd E. Hamilton, Th.M. James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 9 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.2, England. 6s. Also Christianity Today, 501 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.50.

An added interest attaches to this volume from the fact that the author was himself trained in college and seminary to believe in what was called "Christian evolution." At that time he thought it could be harmonized with the teaching of the Bible. But by further investigation along both scientific and exegetical lines, he was forced to abandon his former views and align himself with the opponents of evolution, even though such a change would make him unpopular with

the scientific intelligentsia. This is his explanation of the change in his views (see preface):

Had the evidence seemed less conclusive, needless to say, the writer would never have abandoned the belief in evolution in which he was trained. It was simply the overwhelming weight of the evidence that forced the change of position.

We have read the book from beginning to end with intense interest, and have received much instruction from it. Well and vividly does the author set forth the present status of the evolutionary faith. Rightly he calls it a "faith." Some of the outstanding advocates of the theory confess that they receive it "by faith," just as if a scientific theory could

be established in that way! The author contends that the champions of evolution have no right to claim immunity from criticism of their hypothesis, and that even intelligent laymen in science, including theologians, have a right to pass judgment upon it, if they examine all the data. His chapter on the origin of life is a very effective argument in favor of direct creation. On the other hand, he holds that spontaneous generation is unproved and unprovable. With keen ability he discusses the cell with its chromosomes and genes, and shows from the facts that the transformation of species is impossible. He displays technical scientific knowledge in dealing with the so-called "evidences" from classification, comparative anatomy, embryology, vestigial organs, blood tests, geographical distribution and palæontology. To our mind he shows, by a large number of counts, that evolution lacks a real scientific basis. Of the many good anti-evolution books that have been published within the last decade, it can truthfully be said that Mr. Hamilton's is one of the most effective. While he is conversant with the scientific facts involved, he knows how to put things felicitously and to use the processes of logic. On the positive side, he shows that creation is the only way to explain all the facts adequately, and that it is eminently reasonable.

Malcolm and Marie. By Oswald J. Smith. Arthur H. Stockwell, Ltd., 29 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4, England. May be ordered from the Author, 29 Kendall Ave., Toronto, Can. 75 cts.

"A romance of the Russian Revolution" is the sub-title of this dramatic story, which is told in blank verse of decided poetical merit. The love story in it is pure and beautiful. Some of the persecutions to which Christian believers were subjected by the Soviets during the revolution are described, and they surely were terrible enough. The author claims to have reliable documentary evidence for the harrowing incidents he describes. He has not relied too much on newspaper and magazine reports, but has the better basis of "published letters received from Russia by various organizations, incidents in the lives of missionaries who escaped from that unhappy country, both men and women, which they themselves related to him, and personal observations during his visits to Europe." Thus, while it is an interesting romance, the author avers that he has "laid bare the truth concerning Bolshevism and its atrocities."

"Follow Thou Me." By George W. Truett, D.D. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41 St., New York. \$2.00.

A number of years ago we had the privilege of reading and reviewing Dr. Truett's impressive book, *A Quest for Souls*. The same fervor, earnestness and concern for souls that marked that book also characterizes the present volume. It comprises sermons and addresses that were taken down stenographically as delivered, and then revised by the author. In this way they show the directness and gracious intimacy of talks to audiences. They are also put in a colloquial style that makes easy and delightful reading. They everywhere prove the author's evangelistic earnestness. Nowhere does he forget for a moment that he is talking either to Christians for their edification or to unsaved people for their conversion. So far as we can judge, underneath these popular and lucid talks there is a foundation of evangelical doctrine. We have not found a place where the author seems to depart from, or modify or shade down the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and the Word of God. For every position taken he invariably makes his appeal to the Holy Scriptures. When a preacher takes the position that Dr. Truett does on the atonement, as set forth in Chapter VI, "The Meaning of Christ's Death," we cannot help feeling that he must be thoroughly evangelical. If he were not, he would be pitifully illogical. This sermon is based on precisely the right text: "For Christ hath suffered once for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God" (2 Pet. 3:15). Here is the holy doctrine as stated by Dr. Truett (96), after he had used an apt illustration about one person suffering for another:

That gives us some faint idea of how Christ took our place, under God's law, and suffered in our stead the full penalty for our sins. There is the way of substitution for sinners. . . . If He were to mete out mercy without regard to law and righteousness, that would make an end of moral government. What does our Lord do? He metes out both justice and mercy at the same time, in the same person—even in Christ, who took our place and suffered in our stead, Himself, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.

Then our author goes on to show why Christ, and Christ alone, was able to make atonement for sinners; and one of the reasons given is that "He is both God and man in one personality." There we have the true gospel of love and expiation, and we believe that such preaching is the only kind that will

bring sinners in contrition and faith to the feet of God.

Martin Luther, Humanist. By Paul Harold Andreen, M.A., Th.D. Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill. 75 cents.

It must not be supposed that our author means to put Luther in the present-day class of Humanists, especially those of the Harry Elmer Barnes type. Dr. Andreen refers to the Humanists of the Renaissance, or the Revival of Learning in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as represented by Petrarch, Boccaccio, Lorenzo Valla, Erasmus, Reuchlin, and others. Dr. Andreen maintains that Luther was a friend and advocate of the new learning, was himself a scholar of technical training, and made use of it in promoting the principles of the Reformation. For example, he knew Hebrew and Greek, the knowledge of which was an outstanding result of the Renaissance, and on account of this knowledge, he, with others, was able to translate the Old and the New Testaments into the German language. Had he not made use of the revived learning, he could not have carried his work of religious reform to the successful issue that he did. Sometimes the claim is made that Luther was no technical scholar; that Erasmus, Reuchlin and Melancthon were the real scholars. Our author proves from much documentary evidence that Luther was also a scholar. He lectured on philosophy; he pointed out the weaknesses of Aristotle; he lectured and wrote on Old and New Testament books, and gave the exegesis; all told he proved himself a master of erudition. But he was not a humanist in the sense that mere worldly Greek and Roman learning was sufficient to transform human nature and reform religious conditions. Human learning with Luther was a means, not an end in itself. We commend Dr. Andreen's study as a very worthy and convincing one. It really views Luther from a new angle, and therefore has the marks of originality.

Hudson Taylor's Legacy: A Series of Meditations. Selected and edited by Marshall Broomhall. China Inland Mission, 237 W. School Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.; 150 St. George St., Toronto 5, Ontario; The Religious Tract Society, 4 Bouverie St., London, E.C.4, England. U.S. money, \$1.00; English money, 2s. 6d.

The biography of Hudson Taylor, written by Mr. Broomhall and reviewed in these columns about a year ago, was more interesting

than any romance that could have been invented, however fertile the author's imagination. And now, in honor of the centenary of Mr. Hudson's birth (May 2, 1832), Mr. Broomhall has brought out this beautiful memorial volume. It consists of selections from Hudson Taylor's published writings, so arranged and somewhat edited as to give one meditation for each day for thirty days. These readings are certainly revealing of Mr. Taylor's character and spiritual life. They display without any thought of ostentation his deeply spiritual nature, his utter devotion to the cause of Christ and the salvation of the Chinese people. This book is a worthy literary memorial of the great missionary, just as the China Inland Mission itself is a standing memorial to his consecration. These meditations also show that he was utterly loyal to the Holy Scriptures and to the divine-human Christ therein revealed. The author of this collection of readings rightly says of Mr. Taylor: "If there was one thing more than another that characterized his utterances, it was the genuine and authentic note of faith in God's Word. He believed it meant just what it said." Yes, that was the secret of his spiritual life and evangelistic power. He never created doubt, but always nourished and galvanized faith. The editor's foreword, introduction and epilogue are all very apropos.

Additional Literary Notes

One of the chief purposes of this review department is to call attention to strong and effective books that uphold the Christian faith in its integrity. For this reason we desire to quote some paragraphs from a letter sent us by Dr. W. Bell Dawson, who so kindly and effectively reviewed Professor W. Schmidt's treatise, *The Origin and Growth of Religion*, in last month's issue of this journal. Dr. Dawson writes:

"In reading such a book there is a strong temptation to make it the basis of a missionary appeal, something to this effect:

"When these primitive peoples have preserved for so long the primary truths concerning God as the Creator, and His goodness, and provision for man, does not this make a strong appeal to us to let them know of the Saviour, the Son of God? For many of them understand already, though perhaps dimly, about sin and the need of repentance. How then can we hold back from them the

fuller light of the gospel, which there is every reason to suppose that they would be glad to have? For there is no misleading system among them of idolatry and error, which needs first to be met and removed.

"It may not be in place for a reviewer to say this; but some missionary periodical might follow up the review on these lines."

We think it eminently proper that Dr. Dawson's missionary appeal should appear in these columns, as this periodical is set for missionary and evangelistic enterprise, as well as for evangelical defense.

In view of the present agitation over prohibition the Defender Publishers, Wichita, Kansas, have put their imprint on a unique and even startling booklet, entitled *Redeeming the Years the Locust Hath Eaten*, by Rev. J. W. Winrod, pastor of a church in Wichita. He tells the story of Carrie Nation, her hatchet and her praying. A bar tender of a saloon in the said city witnessed Mrs. Nation's exploits and heard her prayers before the saloon in which he was employed. They were the means of his conversion, not only to temperance, but to Christianity; and that one-time bar-tender is now the author of this booklet. The price is 25 cents.

The modernistic propaganda still goes on. Here is a book entitled *Jesus in our Teaching*, by Dr. Clarence T. Craig, Professor of New Testament in the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. It is published by the Abingdon Press, New York, which is supposed to be a church publishing concern. Of this book a careful and competent reviewer for *The Presbyterian* has the following to say:

A good illustration of the insulation of the modernistic mind. Blandly ignorant of the immense mass of evidence to the contrary, the author assumes that supernatural Christianity is dead, and that the greater part of the contents of the four gospels is unhistorical and untrustworthy. He discards all that asserts or implies the authority and deity of Jesus. Having overthrown all that is distinctive in the Saviour, he is left with the modernist riddle on his hands: What and how shall we teach our children about Jesus?

The answer is characteristic: Teach them that the false statements of the gospels are "interpretations" of Jesus by the early church, but they are mistaken "interpretations." Minimize the teaching of fact about Jesus, and "stress his character and His ethics." The reviewer then draws his conclusions about this liberalistic book:

The book is one of the "Abingdon Religious Education Monographs." It helps to explain the liberalism now pervading a great denomination. Certainly it can by no stretch of the imagination be called a textbook on Christian education, for it has eliminated Christ.

And yet it bears the imprint of the publication house of a great denomination of Christian people who are bound by their very constitution to the Christ of the Holy Scriptures!

The battle is not over—no! no! The Modernists are still busy with their propaganda, as will be seen in another case. According to the *Moody Monthly*, Dr. Philpott, in a recent address at the Bible Institute, told about a flagrant instance in point. To quote from the *Monthly*:

An illustration he (Dr. Philpott) used was the new book by Shirley Jackson Case, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, in which the author declares that Jesus should no longer be considered a standard of perfection, but simply an inspirational figure. He is not an unattainable model of perfect living, he said. His teachings are not to be accepted as infallible rules of conduct; indeed, to do so is to ignore the findings of historical research and hinder true religious living.

We copy the following direct quotation from Dr. Case's book, as it is given by the editor of the *Moody Monthly*, just to show how Modernism diminishes the divine-human Christ of the Bible:

The new appreciation of Jesus is concerned with His personal religious living so far as it is recoverable from the pages of history. Instead of seeking metaphysical justification for making Him the object of our worship, we take our place at His side while He worships. We do not ask Him to tell us how we ought to worship or what we ought to worship; we only ask the privilege of close fellowship with Him amid the characteristic scenes of His earthly career.

Thus we see that Drs. Case and Fosdick agree that it is improper to worship our Lord Jesus Christ. Note, too, what Dr. Case does with the Bible. He says that we do not ask Jesus to tell us how or what to worship. But Jesus told us both in John 4:24: "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." Then, in another statement in the same gospel (John 5:22,23) Jesus places Himself on an equality with the Father: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father; He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father who

nath sent Him." When Thomas, convinced by the resurrection of Jesus, said to Him, "My Lord and my God," Jesus commended him and accepted his tribute.

All of us know that the Denver Bible Institute, whose president is Dr. Clifton L. Fowler, stands foursquare for the Christian fundamentals. We are pleased to receive a number of booklets written by Dr. Fowler. They are well written, and the contents are spiritually uplifting. Dr. Fowler is a close student of the Bible and a careful interpreter. *Salvation and Rewards* is the title of one of these booklets, in which he shows that salvation is for all who believe in Christ and is a pure gift. The rewards promised are only for those who accept Christ. In *The Gift of Giving* Dr. Fowler sets forth the true

spirit and method of giving to the Lord's cause. We think a good many interpreters will differ somewhat from Dr. Fowler's expositions in *The Angels that Sinned*, not in the fact that they did fall, but in the particular sin that caused their fall. However, the book is very interesting. In the booklet, *Not Cursed, but Nigh*, Dr. Fowler advocates earnestly "the eternal security of believers." He endorses the maxim, "Once saved, always saved." A beautifully printed leaflet bears the title, *Something Happened*. The main idea of the tract is that, "when a Christian prays, something happens." The author declares that "this is not an imagination, but a glorious reality." For this literature, address the Denver Bible Institute, Denver, Colorado.

Editor's Mail

Added Information— A Correction

[I HAVE just received a kind and brotherly letter from the Methodist pastor at Upand, Pa., commending my article "The Supreme Value of Truth," and asking its publication in the Church periodicals. Rev. C. E. Terhune calls attention to my statement concerning Stephen Girard's prohibition of any preacher of the Gospel ever entering the campus, and says that I was in error in saying "that statement can be seen over the gateway today." He says that "no such inscription is found over the entrance gate." For this correction the writer is thankful.

I got my information concerning the will and the gateway inscription from the *Homiletic Review* some years ago. No doubt the inscription was there when the *Review* made the statement but since has been taken down, as it should have been.

Brother Terhune then quotes a part of the will of Stephen Girard:

I enjoin and require, that no ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatsoever, shall ever hold or exercise any station or duty whatever in the said college: nor shall any such person ever be admitted for any purpose, or as a visitor, within the premises appropriated for the said college. . . . do not mean to cast reflection on any sect or person whatsoever, but as there is such diversity of

opinion among them, I desire to keep the tender minds of the orphans, who are to derive advantage from this bequest, free from the excitement which clashing doctrines may produce. . . . My desire is that all the teachers shall take pains to instill into the minds of the scholars the purest principles of morality, so that on entering life they may evidence benevolence towards their fellows, a love of truth, sobriety and industry . . . adopting such religious tenets as their mature minds may enable them to prefer.

Now, what is the soul of all this, but what the world knows as pure "infidelity"? This same excuse of the warring denominations was often made use of by men who would not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Benjamin Franklin, who never became a Christian, made the same plea to his pious old New England father. Thomas Jefferson did the same thing when he took his many versions of the New Testament and cut out all the evidence of the divinity of Christ, and patched up his *Morals of Jesus*,—photostats of which may be seen today.

Those men doubtless were sincere in their beliefs in "morality" as the hope of the world. But, shall we of today, stand aside and let the Modernists in their denial of the divinity of Christ, have the right of way after one hundred and fifty years of strenuous strife in planting Christianity at the center of the nation's life?—C. H. Buchanan, D.D., Richmond, Kentucky.

The Most Insidious Heresy— A Reply

THE Most Insidious Heresy." Under this caption Dr. Clarence True Wilson, one of your contributing editors, writes in the February issue of your paper. The "most insidious heresy" to which he calls the attention of the church is "the defective programme of the 'Religious Education' movement."

Without offering the slightest scintilla of evidence of the facts Dr. Wilson asserts that this movement

Has had the whole machinery of the church for a score of years, its Book Concern, its colleges, its theological schools, its money, its ministry; and now we are reaping the fruit of its planting—50,000 loss in membership and \$900,000 lost in benevolences.

A little reflection upon the facts would have restrained the doctor from this unwarranted extravagance, so unfair to a large and loyal group of workers in the church. He must know that the "Religious Education" movement, as he calls it has not really been under way for a full decade yet, that it has had to create a demand for the publications it has been able to have the publishing houses put out, that our colleges and even our theological schools have rather reluctantly yielded to the demand for courses of study that trained a leadership for the educational tasks of the modern church, that both in the local church and in the work of the conferences generally Sunday schools and other educational agencies have commanded the most modest amounts for their enterprises, and that ministers have given their attention to the work of Christian education largely because of the calls that have come from young life and puzzled parents for adequate spiritual guidance.

Dr. Wilson must know that there is not the slightest connection between a decreasing membership, the shrinking funds for benevolences and the new emphasis upon Christian training. As a matter of fact during the past decade, when revivalism has fallen into disrepute under the weight of a mercenary and spectacular program, the church has had to look to its training work for accretions to its membership. An overwhelming majority of those who have come into the church during recent years have come through the church school.

The "Religious Education" movement has not interfered with "holiness revivals" and "evangelistic crusades" as Dr. Wilson supposes. The fact that these are no longer the order of our day is to be traced to weaknesses in the policies and methods of those who have promoted them. The man in the street simply became disgusted with what he found in many of the revival meetings and he refused longer to attend. It is an open secret in the life of the vast majority of pastors that the unchurched group of the community will not attend revival services. That was just as true ten years ago as it is today. If Dr. Wilson will promise to make an "evangelistic crusade" effective and keep the emphasis on religion and not on money, he can find a thousand churches open to him tomorrow and mine will be one of them. He is of course busy with other responsibilities, doing a great work from which he can not come down. Still if he has discovered the "most insidious heresy" in the modern church and is master of the methods by which it might be uprooted, it is possible he might do a greater work in another field.

Because Dr. Wilson knows one college president, one scholar and teacher in our church who hold "that a sinner can be transformed into a saint by an educational process" he seems to ascribe faith in that doctrine to all workers in religious education. However he would be one of the first to condemn that process of reasoning applied to some other relations in the church. I venture a guess—the facts are not at hand for any of us—that the vast majority of those engaged in the various branches of Christian training in the church are as loyal to its doctrines and policies as any other company in it.—*J. Calloway Robertson, D.D., Richmond, Virginia.*

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE believes firmly in the policy of free discussion; however we are moved to add that the religious education movement often has been remote from a Christian programme. To be specific: It has ignored the problem of guilt and redemption, and has substituted a psychological programme of habit formation, instinct culture, instinct inhibition, etc. It has missed the significance of Christ's person valuing Him almost exclusively as a teacher and exemplar. This is the recurring heresy of the Christian centuries and has always prostrated the church.—*Editor.*